

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VI

OCTOBER, 1905

NO. 4

Recent Tendencies in German Social Democracy.

THE convention of the social democratic party of Germany, which has just been held in Jena, was undoubtedly the most important of all the many important ones held by that great wing of the International socialist movement. The questions to be decided, the character of the discussion, both before and during the convention all indicate that the long years of growth in the German socialist party have reached a climax and that the next few years are going to see history making events in the realm of the Kaiser.

No one will accuse Comrade Kautsky of being an alarmist, yet he uses the following words in the columns of that staid and scientific publication, *Die Neue Zeit* to describe the convention and the conditions amid which it met.

"Never, since the birth of our party, has one of its conventions met during such violently revolutionary times as exists to-day. Even the events of 1870-71 pale compared with those of the Russian revolution. At that time the empire fell at the first blow, but only to give way to a republic that was little more than empire without the emperor. The governmental institutions, bureaucracy, and army, nothing was touched. Even the rising of the Paris commune, glorious as it was, was but the revolt of a single city for a few weeks.

"In Russia, on the contrary, we have a revolution that is shattering the foundation of an entire nation, and that even now has completely disorganized the governmental institutions, bureaucracy and army. A revolution in which the proletariat, not

of one single city, but of every great city of the nation have fought, not for weeks, but for months, and sometimes almost for an entire year. A revolution that from the beginning has found the strongest motive force in the industrial proletariat.

"But it is not alone in its extent and significance, but still more in the consequences that it draws after it that the present Russian revolution is distinguished from that of France in 1870-71. The Russian revolt, in spite of its occasionally strong proletarian character, constitutes the *conclusion of the era of bourgeois revolutions in Europe*. It also, in spite of the bourgeois character, which it still bears, constitutes the *beginning of the era of proletarian revolutions* upon which we are just entering. The events of 1870-71 broke the lethargy of all Europe, and destroyed the equilibrium of its relations. It opened for Europe, with the single temporary exception of Russia and Turkey, a period of peace and free economic development.

"The events of 1905, on the contrary, throw all relations, however fixed they may have been in the past, into a state of instability; they conceal within themselves war, famine, violent overthrow of the present legal order of landlords and usurers, violent resistance of the proletariat, revolutionary conditions of all kinds.

"How suddenly such situations can arise in a country where but yesterday all the world considered them impossible is shown by Hungary.

"It is impossible for us to tell at the present moment what form this struggle will take or what tasks for us will come out of this witches' kettle. But one thing is certain, and that is that we can depend upon almost anything sooner than the permanence of the present situation. No politician is so sure of early shipwreck as the one who depends upon the permanence of existing institutions.

"Every moment of today is pregnant with surprises; it is a time to watch with open eyes, to examine every change on the political horizon, to keep in readiness for the most strenuous exertions, for the political barometer indicates storms ahead."

The report of the party management which is prepared every year before the convention shows an increased strength at every point, notwithstanding the somewhat discouraging result of the by-elections for the Reichstag. The great three million vote has brought with it the necessity for a great extension of organization and education and this work has been actively taken up and pushed throughout the entire membership. The report states that: "In order to cultivate the existing talent many cities have already formed institutions for instruction during the last year, for example a school for agitators was founded in Düsseldorf."

It is difficult to give exact figures of party membership, owing to the method of organization, but all localities report large

increases. In the district around Berlin, for instance, the membership has increased from 37,905 on January 1, 1904, to 47,420 one year later. Great demonstrations have been carried on against the attempt to restrict the suffrage and in favor of peace. Some of these, having already been reported in these columns, need not receive further attention.

The party press reports everywhere increased circulation, and several papers, hitherto constituting a burden upon the party, have become self-supporting. The *Vorwärts* shows a total profit of over \$20,000 during the last year. *Der Wahre Jacob* brought in nearly \$5,000, while *Die Neue Zeit* showed a deficit of over \$1,000, indicating that even this long established and foremost scientific socialist publication of the world is still run at a loss. The total income of the party amounts to over \$180,000 and the number of agitation leaflets and books distributed runs high into the millions.

Meanwhile, however, the party is engaged in internal discussions of more fundamental importance than any that have occupied its attention since the days of the laws of exception. The whole form of party organization is being changed toward a greater centralization. A more revolutionary attitude is permeating its ranks and its membership at every point. It is evidently drawing together for the great battle that all predict must take place in the near future.

The discussions have taken on various forms. One of these is an attack upon the editorial management of the *Vorwärts*. The attack has been conducted largely by the *Leipziger Volkszeitung* and the *Neue Zeit*. The *Vorwärts* has for a long time taken a sort of ostrich attitude with regard to party differences, burying its head in the sand and insisting that it could see no quarrels. It has, for example, constantly denied that there were any divisions between the revisionists and the Marxists. In the meantime, however, it had been gradually drifting away from Marxism. This was seen in its attitude toward the general strike, toward the Russian situation, as was pointed out in an article of Comrade Kautsky's published in an earlier number of the REVIEW, and in its general refusal to participate in party discussions. The result which might have been expected has now occurred. This long smothered discussion has broken out with much greater intensity than it could have possessed had it been conducted openly from the beginning and the *Vorwärts*, so far from being able to maintain its impartial attitude, is now the very center of the turmoil. Kautsky's final article on the matter sums up the whole situation in so broadly a fundamental way as to be applicable to the situation nearly everywhere and especially in this country. From this we take the following quotation:

"SENTIMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC SOCIALISM."

"The *Vorwärts* of today is not the same that it was in the years immediately following the socialist laws of exception. At that time the economic attitude dominated its work. Its policies were formulated by people who were familiar with political economy and economic history and possessed the keenest interest and the fullest understanding of the relations between economics and politics. To grasp this relation and set it forth and thereby explain to their readers modern social and political life appeared to it as its principle purpose. Its attitude was predominantly scientific since social democracy, and indeed modern politics as a whole, is essentially dominated by economic historical thought.

"Today the ethical-esthetic attitude predominates in *Vorwärts*. It is concerned much less with the comprehension of things than with judgments of them. It seeks first of all to produce strong moral and esthetical effects in order to arouse the disgust of its readers against the immorality and hideousness of the existing order. Just as the former attitude of mind may be called scientific socialism, so the latter may be designated as sentimental socialism; not in the sense that its representatives have any less scientific culture or represent less scientific interests, but that the fundamental thing for them in politics is not scientific insight but the attainment of moral and asthetic feelings and sensations.

* * * * *

"Naturally I have no intention of entering upon a philosophical dissertation concerning the antagonism between the economic and the ethical-esthetic attitude in the theory of socialism. I have still less reason for doing this because of the fact that the first has found a very accurate expression in the Marxian theory, and that the other still awaits the production of a theoretician.

We are here concerned alone with the effect of the two methods of thought upon our political tactics. There it is easily possible that they may become antagonistic, and this wholly apart for the desire of any individual.

"Naturally I would by no means claim that ethics and esthetics have no part in the struggle of social democracy. In political economy to be sure ethics has no part; neither in the scientific socialism founded upon it. These are concerned with the investigation of social relations. If these end in the formation of conclusions concerning the future, they are as little influenced by ethical demands as are the practical consequences to which modern hygiene leads. But scientific socialism forms only one side of social democracy. The latter is a union of theory and practice, of science and battle, and just as little as ethics or even esthetics enter into scientific investigation, nevertheless they are

of great importance in the class struggle of the proletariat. No class in the midst of a class struggle can wholly dispense with the ethical forces—the sacrifice and enthusiasm of its adherents for its goal. Least of all can a class like the proletariat do this, which has to meet the coercive power of the state and economic superiority, with nothing but the united solidarity of the masses, which becomes the more powerful with the strengthening of its ethical sensations.

“The esthetic element also can play a great part in the politics of the class struggle. Politics and art, especially poetic art, have many points of contact; both seek to elevate and better mankind in the highest degree, both seek to touch and exhaust the greatest depths of the human soul.

“Far from the song of politics being necessary a disgusting song politics and arts can in many ways be of mutual assistance. The politician can give valuable material to the artist and art can mightily strengthen the powers of the politician.

“So it would appear as if there must be complete harmony between these two methods of thought in political practice, but as a matter of fact both cannot simultaneously dominate. Where the economic scientific attitude preponderates and determines the tactics and directions of the economic factor, the two must come in conflict. The *Vorwärts* illustrates this in a most striking manner.

“In its very valuation of the significance of daily events the antagonism between the scientific and the sentimental socialist is evident. What is in the highest degree interesting to the one appears to the other as unimportant and indeed insignificant. While those things that arouse the strongest momentary activity of the emotions is not always that which influences state and society most fundamentally.

“The events and questions that have the strongest and most enduring effect on the evolution of the whole are often of an insignificant appearance, difficult to recognize and generally only apparent after investigation, and having very little relation to ethical events. The description of a usurer who mercilessly crushes his victims has a much different effect in arousing emotions than a theory of capital. But the effective ethical phenomena and questions are just these superficial phases of things.

“So it is that the journalist who is dominated by the ethical point of view is inclined to consider the superficial sensational phenomena of the moment, as of the greatest political importance, and to look upon all further investigation as a work having little significance with politics. The investigation of the significance and outlook for the general strike, for example, appears to him as wholly unnecessary so long as this is not at our very doors.

A case of judicial abuse of authority on the other hand becomes an event to which he cannot devote enough attention.

"But it is not alone that the over valuation of ethical interests leads the political party journalist to superficiality and sensation mongering, to an undervaluation of investigation into the reasons for agitation—all of which does not prevent him from *theoretically* claiming the greatest admiration for investigation and declaring that all "science" and "explanation" are of the greatest value. This deeper investigation in practice often has a horror for him.

"There is nothing easier than to unite mankind 'ethically,' and to arouse their moral indignation against disgusting phenomena. These superficial phenomena are generally very simple and it is ordinarily not difficult to come to a judgment as to whether they are good or bad. Nothing, for example, is easier than to arouse the public opinion of the whole civilized world against the instigators of the Jewish massacre of Kishineff. So it was that the *Vorwärts* began to dream that we could some time make such an impression upon public opinion that only a 'small present' of the population would be opposed to us, and this small present would be 'condemned to helplessness' through their isolation.

"If we are not satisfied with condemnation but seek to understand and observe these revolting cruel phenomena of our society, not by themselves alone, but in their relations: if we seek to investigate their reasons and to understand how far and in what way we are to meet them, then we strike upon highly conflicting questions, the answers to which are of the most divergent character according to the way in which they are presented and the class position of those who are called upon to act.

"Turn, for example, once more to so apparently a simple question as to the Jewish massacre of Kishineff. Nothing is easier than to become indignant over this. On the other hand great differences appear as quick as we ask from whence comes this phenomena, how shall they be removed? In what relation do they stand to the political and social conditions of all Russia, indeed, of all the world? Shall we strive for the assimilation of the Jews, their absorption into the surrounding population, or for their unrestricted organization as an independent nation? If we favor the latter shall we seek their national independence within Russia, or the creation of a new state for them? All these questions are related to each other and to that of the Russian absolutism. Where are the roots of its power and how shall they be undermined? Concerning these the most manifold differences appear.

"If the ethical method leads to the easiest possible union of diverse elements it is undoubtedly true that the economic materialist leads with equal ease to strife and to division even of

those elements that belong together. It is evident that the first method finds its activity injured and restricted by the second, since the latter rejects the former, sows dissension where that unites and consequently that the followers of the ethical method wish to get rid of all "internal questions" which appear to them to serve only to destroy the uniform moral uprising that they have aroused or think they have aroused.

"These reproaches are, to be sure, baseless. It is not the unity of moral indignation or of 'public opinion' that moves the world and condemns our opponents to helplessness, but the unity of *action*. This will never be created, simply by moral indignation. It is only necessary to return once more to our illustration. If there was ever complete unity of the public opinion of the whole civilized world it was in opposition to the massacre of Kishineff. Was the Russian absolutism thereby 'condemned to helplessness?' Not a hair of it was disturbed, not an iota of its power taken away, not a single Russian loan among European financial Jews hindered. But wherever 'public opinion' or moral indignation is strong enough to compel action it is never so uniform as is the indignation. The latter only demands that something shall *not* be done, that something be condemned, but says nothing whatever about what shall take its place, or how it shall be brought about, and views about these things will differ, and the action will be more divergent, just in proportion as the battle of theoretical discussion has not previously taken place in order that the attitude may be made clear.

"The play of ethical sentimental socialism is much more extensive in the romantic lands, even in the daily press, and the ethical literary politics plays a much greater role than with us. But it is just in these lands that we find the greatest disintegration in organization and action. The unity of organization and action which has so strikingly characterized the German Social Democracy is in no slight degree a result of the fact that from the very beginning it has cherished that 'fundamental error,' according to *Vorwärts*, of discussing its internal questions at its congresses and in the party press with the most intense interest. So for example, in the case of general strike, any united action of party and unions was only possible after the most thoroughgoing discussion concerning all its phases and its tactics. If the party and the unions had been satisfied with the attitude which our central organ advocated, that in case of a *coup d'état* all means, including that of a general strike, are morally justifiable, and that in such a case even all the citizens would be morally obligated to strike, then this moral meaningless side of the question would alone have been kept in mind and the study of the material side would have been wholly rejected; then indeed many a 'party quarrel' would have been

avoided, but on the day of action the uniform moral uprising would have been transformed into a headless chaos with the application of *all* means including the most contradictory and purposeless.

"The distinction of the ethical and sentimental attitude in party journalism leads to still other phenomena. I have already remarked that it is very easy to arouse indignation concerning single horrible phenomena of the present society. Indeed nearly all mankind are generally aroused in much the same manner by every horror from which they do not derive any advantage. Who is there that is not aroused by a misuse of women and children, or the treatment of miners by the coal barons? The *Vorwärts* is right when it avows that the whole population can be aroused to indignation by the publication of such facts 'with the exception of a small percent of those who through their favorable position in the present society are from the nature of things the enemies of the labor movement.' This does not prove, however, that with the exception of this 'small percent' all classes of the people in our present division of society can be won for the battle of socialism, but rather that this indignation is no especial sign of a socialist; but that in such a movement the latter is only distinguished from the remainder of the population by the greater intensity of his sensations. He is distinguished, however, from the adherents of all other parties, as well as from the mass of indifferent, by his economic insight into the relation of these horrors to the total process of present society; it is his distinctive characteristic that it is only by this that he can be convinced.

"This is naturally a point of view shared by every party member and which makes him a party member. But its expression becomes less and less evident the more the ethical side of politics is brought to the front. The ethical side is in no way peculiar to us, but is shared with countless bourgeois elements for example with social reformers as well as the bourgeois radicals, and indeed by avowed reactionaries, pious Christians and the like.

"Never was it more essential than just at present to place the theoretical socialist education in the foreground of the party press, and not simply to sow ethical indignation against Byzantinism, popular brutalization and exploitation, but to show the justice and necessity of Socialism in the light of daily events, with their fundamental economic motive forces. Ever larger grows the influx of untrained elements in the party, and the unions; ever more numerous the practical tasks, and the shorter the time accessible to each individual for study. Relative to the number of party members and the unions our book and pamphlet literature de-

creases in importance and is fairly swamped by the daily papers. To these latter falls more and more the task of spreading the theoretical insight and socialist knowledge, and this, not simply by means of scientific supplements, that are never noticed by the majority of readers, but in the very dealing with the questions of the day, politics, legal events and the economic struggle. Here it is necessary to turn the mind of the reader from the superficial sensations, on which the bourgeois press so richly feeds him, and direct his attention to the deeper social relations and their lines of evolution."

It is impossible to give any full reports of the work of the Congress, as only the Associated Press dispatches are available. These report that the three main topics of the convention were the question of the celebration of the first of May, the reorganization of the party, and the general strike, or as it is called in Germany to distinguish it from the anarchistic use of the same words the "political mass strike."

The discussion of this question reflected the strained relations that are now existing in Germany. The kingdom of Saxony and several of the Hanse cities, including Hamburg, have taken steps to further restrict popular suffrage. In the face of this situation the party decided that if anything was actually done towards further restricting the right to vote that the mass strike would be declared.

This attitude of the party with regard to the general strike, which has hitherto been rather disdained by the German socialists, is extremely significant, and is suggestive of what we may soon expect to see in the United States. The recent actions in Colorado and other places indicate a willingness of the capitalist class of America to resort to violent and illegal methods the moment the class war becomes particularly sharp. It behooves the Socialist Party to prepare itself to meet these attacks. This is one of the more important reasons why the Industrial Workers of the World is a necessity at this time on the industrial field to render possible effective co-operation of all portions of the proletarian army.

A. M. SIMONS.

The Gist of Marxism.

CARL MARX established the science of political life. It is the science of collective action, the law of social movements, of social life considered as a "process." We commonly speak of socialism in distinction from individualism, but this is misleading and should be avoided. When we come to look closely we find that there is no such thing as individualism. Our present society is not individualistic. It is not established to protect the rights of the individual. To concede this is to give our whole case away.

No society could possibly be more ruthless of the rights of the individual than our present society. These count for nothing and are sacrificed by thousands without the slightest compunction, as if the sacrifice were a religious duty. In fact, one of the most striking phenomena of present times is the absolute indifference and callousness amounting to fatalism of the so-called public for the rights and wrongs of individuals. There is something higher in present society than the individual. In other words, our present society is collective. It is managed by and for a collectivity. This collectivity is a property class called the capitalist class. Fealty to this collectivity is to-day the essence of religion, patriotism, civic duty and all ethics. Disloyalty to this collectivity is called sedition, treason, immorality, pessimism, etc.

Such is the discovery that Marx made, and it does not seem to be very much of a discovery until you come to measure its importance by the fury it arouses when an attempt is made to draw the logical conclusions from it. Then hell breaks loose; the existence of classes is vociferously denied and the claim is brazenly put forth that present society stands for the individual, but not for any class.

Marx went a step deeper and explained how classes are formed out of industrial conditions. But we are not now concerned about the origin and disappearance of classes. We are merely discussing the next-to-hand fact that classes do exist and that social life, even under class rule, is collective and not individualistic.

Every society must have a collectivity as its essential and vital part. Its life is collective. This collectivity may embrace only a part or it may embrace the whole of the society, as it will under socialism. The issue therefore is not socialism versus individualism, both being forms of collective life. Marx's discovery has called into existence a number of new words, such as classism, classal, class-interests, class-consciousness, etc.

In civil life classes have no formal existence in law. Hence it is easy in argument to claim that there are no classes in this country and to quote the constitution and statutes to prove it. But as the statutes are merely paper, printed and bound, this only means that we have no classes *on paper*. So much the more do we have them in fact. But in political life classes exist on paper as well as in fact. They are called parties and are recognized in the law. Since the existence of political parties cannot be denied (as are classes), the only thing the hypocrites can do is to deprecate them as a necessary evil. But with Marx parties are not a necessary evil. They are at present a necessary good; and the spirit of partisanship, the sacrifice of individual interests for party welfare is the noblest sacrifice, the highest expression of ethics, we have yet reached and ranks equally with the sacrifice of the soldier who lays his life and honor on the altar of his (supposed) country. But the glory of partisanship is at the same time its own condemnation. So long as classes exist no other form of ethics is possible except partisanship or class fealty. All other forms are excluded. We throw out this hint for the benefit of the charity workers, who stand on a moral plane far below the stalwart partisan.

But there is a form of ethics yet higher than partisanship. That is, under socialism, when all classes and parties are merged into the totality, the sacrifice of individual interests will then be for the benefit of the totality and not simply for a collectivity consisting of one class or one party only. Not only that, but the individual sacrifice will lose its altruistic character and become a matter of self-interest. Extremes will meet. Collectivism and individualism will be merged into each other, as they never can be under classism.

This is the gist of Marxism for us. But besides being a political philosopher Marx was also a materialist and an economist. Although we do not agree with him in these two latter capacities, we have no desire to stir up a controversy on these subjects. We only hope that the attention devoted to these by socialist writers will not cause the political doctrine of Marx to become obscured, but that it will retain its place at the very head and front of the Marxian edifice.

MARCUS HITCH.

Socialism and Philosophy.

THE following pages are in part a reply to a short article by Mr. Charles H. Chase, entitled "Materialism and its Relations to Propagandism of Socialism," which appeared in this magazine as long ago as November, 1903, in part an attempt towards a rough sketch of the general relations of socialist theory and philosophy,—a subject which has of recent years received but scant attention in American and English socialist journals.

Mr. Chase's main contention was, that idealism and not materialism should be accepted as the philosophical basis of socialism (and evolution); and he objected to materialism because of its defectiveness as a philosophic theory and its determinism. Unfortunately, in stating his objections to materialism, Mr. Chase reduced his argument to chaos by confounding determinism with predestinarianism, and by using the word fortuitous in such a way as to awaken the impression that, according to the materialistic hypothesis, certain portions of the universe are not subject to what we call natural law. So far as the dogmatic philosophical materialists are concerned, I am in substantial agreement with Mr. Chase, who calls their explanations of the ultimate nature of phenomena irrational assumptions; on the other hand, I am equally convinced that the assumptions of dogmatic idealists are no less irrational. And although few of us would care to go as far as John Licke, and say that it is best to "sit down in quiet ignorance of those things which upon examination are found to be beyond the reach of our capacities,"—for there is no telling what development of our capacities the future may bring,—or assert with the agnostic that these same things are not only unknown but unknowable, we are at any rate certain that until more knowledge is at our disposal than at the present time, all explanations of the totality of things must of necessity be irrational and imperfect.

Philosophy, as generally understood to-day, may be characterized as the science, or study, which seeks to form a synthesis of, and at the same time to supplement and criticise, the results which are being obtained in the various departments of human knowledge. It is the office of the special sciences to collect and weigh facts and to co-ordinate or systematize our knowledge of particular classes of phenomena. It is the duty of philosophy to investigate critically and to organize into a whole the results which have been obtained in the special sciences. It generally

happens that the results obtained in any one field of research cannot be thoroughly understood except in relation to the others; and it is in its criticising, co-ordinating function, which is apt to lead to the development of new and suggestive hypotheses, that the chief value of philosophy lies. It is clear that the special sciences must react upon philosophy and necessitate a constant shifting of its data and principles, and philosophy in turn, by virtue of its criticism and systematization, must react upon and, to a certain degree, modify the results achieved by the special sciences. From this it follows in theory,—and here theory is for once wholly in harmony with practice,—first, that there can be but *one* philosophy in the sense in which the word is used to-day, although there may be many philosophical theories, and, second, that philosophy, like its subject-matter the special branches of knowledge, must undergo continual transformation and development. The folly of attempting to build up a complete system of philosophy in the expectation of arriving at the ultimate truth of things, or of searching for *a-priori* principles from which a satisfactory explanation of the entire universe may be obtained, is self-evident. This, it is true, is denied by metaphysicians; and in the article by Mr. Chase we find the statement that there can be no philosophy without a metaphysical basis, that the philosophy which ignores metaphysics has no foundation,—no commanding power to give it credence.

Now, in view of the fact that during the last two or three centuries the chief endeavor of the more independent and advanced thinkers of the world has been to eliminate the transcendental element from philosophical, no less than from scientific research in general, it may well be asked, how is it that at this late day it can be considered desirable or necessary that philosophy should have a metaphysical foundation?*. A partial answer to this query is given in the last few words of the preceding paragraph; namely, that some philosophers desire a commanding power to give their systems credence. In other words, these so-called "systems" are designed for some ulterior purpose, or, at least, to harmonize with some preconceived belief, and are in consequence based on dogmatic *a-priori* conceptions which are neither to be disproved nor demonstrated. For it is evident that the moment a commanding power to give anything credence is desired, someone has an axe to grind, and in the

*It is plain that we must take many things for granted, of which we are as yet unable to offer any adequate explanation; but the fact that we are still unable to offer an adequate explanation is surely no excuse for our putting forth prematurely an obviously inadequate one and calling it absolute truth, as is the practice of metaphysicians. The foundation of philosophy, no less than of science, is the facts of life as presented to us in consciousness, in other words, as perceived by us; and the completeness of philosophy depends upon the completeness of our knowledge of these facts; not upon *a priori* speculations.

case of metaphysical speculation the axe generally consists in theological conceptions of God, immortality, freedom of the will, and the like, or such political and ethical notions as are conformable with one or another established form of society. Berkeley, for example, worked out his celebrated theory of knowledge with the avowed purpose of inquiring into the "Grounds of Scepticism, Atheism, and Irreligion," and of refuting them; and the more recent attempts of various German philosophers of history have been directed rather to the disproof of the theories of socialism, notably historical materialism, than to the sifting of fresh data or the discovery of new and important truths. As John Stuart Mill said in his essay on the *Utility of Religion*, "The whole of the prevalent metaphysics of the present century is one tissue of suborned evidence in favor of religion; often of Deism only, but in any case involving a misapplication of noble impulses and speculative capacities, among the most deplorable of those wretched wastes of human faculties which make us wonder that enough is left to keep mankind progressive, at however slow a pace;* apart from the nobility of the impulses, which experience has so often given us reason to doubt, John Stuart Mill was right.

On the other hand, there are systems of philosophy with metaphysical tendencies which may be considered as little more than weapons forged for the purpose of combatting those same survivals in the shape of creed and dogma which are still held to be the most valuable of the possessions of the organized churches. The common-sense materialism of natural science, for example, provides us with a complete armament of slings and arrows to be used on the dogmas of orthodox and official theology; and in so far as it is based upon natural law and the facts which have been supplied to us by our actual experience of phenomena, and is kept to its proper use as a working hypothesis, it is entitled to our respect and adherence;—for, indeed, as a working hypothesis it has no equal. As soon, however, as materialism is rounded off into a philosophical "system,"—monistic, pluralistic, or otherwise,—it at once becomes saturated, so to speak, with metaphysical elements (Haeckel's *Riddle of the Universe* is a good example), and forfeits all right to be taken seriously as philosophy, although it still retains its potency as a means of waging war on the metaphysics of theology, and in the hands of the militant free-thinkers of to-day is playing a by no means unimportant role in the progress of civilization and enlightenment. Only we must not deceive ourselves into believing it to be worth much more as philosophy than the idealistic

*Three Essays on Religion, third edition, p. 72.

or dualistic systems it would destroy. Moreover, the ethical and social teachings of a Büchner, Haeckel, or Strauss—a kindred soul, yet hardly to be called a materialist,—are, as reflections of the spirit of middle-class capitalism, not only antiquated but wholly to be condemned.*

Another reason why metaphysics still continues to meet with favor in certain quarters, is to be found in the fact, already stated, that philosophy is far from being either complete or immutable. To the solution of some of its problems,—such, for example, as are presented by the theories of knowledge and of the beginning of things,—an apparently insurmountable barrier is presented by the limits of the human intellect itself. Some of its branches, particularly ethics, history and statistics—in fact, all of the social sciences,—are still in their early infancy, and few others can yet be said to have passed their introductory stages. Fresh problems are continually arising, and as each step forward throws light not only upon the subject immediately at hand, but also upon those branches of knowledge which stand nearest to it, the scene is one of constant transformation and development.

To some naive, emotional souls this is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs. That philosophy should be capable of transformation and development is no less disturbing to them than that its fundamental conceptions are naturalistic and not mystical. Neither content nor able gradually to work their way onwards on the basis of what has already been achieved by patient research, they are irresistibly impelled to create for themselves a complete cosmology, ontology, epistemology and what not, in the light of which all phenomena shall be accounted for and all problems find a solution. Instead of a transformed and transforming science, they want truth—absolute and impregnable—and inasmuch as many systems of absolute truth have been and still are being offered to the credulous, each chooses for himself the one which appeals most to his temperament, his politics, or his creed—and fossilizes. Such metaphysicians as a rule have no axe to grind other than the subjective ideological one supplied by their own nature; whatever their failings they are sincere, and although as a rule too greatly absorbed by their visions of transcendental perfection to be of much use in this imperfect world, they are harmless.

The farther back in time we go, the greater necessity there

*Strauss, to choose a random example, considered the abolition of capital punishment "a crime against society;" in regard to the labor question, he advises employers to help themselves, very much as they are helping themselves to-day saying—"you have it in your power; if they refuse to work for you at your price, oppose them with the refusal to permit them to work for you at their price; if necessary, import laborers from foreign lands that the refractory ones may see who is able to hold out the longest!"

"these besotted fanatical masses" (in allusion to the working class).
Comp. The Old and the New Belief, sections 83, 86, etc.

was for speculation. Spinoza,—the very last man whom one could suspect of being a metaphysician,—prefaced his thoroughly naturalistic philosophy with a collection of *a-priori* definitions and axioms which from the point of view of consummate art are never likely to find their equal. At his time it was incumbent upon philosophers to build up complete systems. Of what use, thought they, is a philosophy which creeps and grovels before the hackneyed (yet unsolved) problems of concrete being instead of rising at once to the region of the abstract and absolute. And this was largely because there had not been enough systematic research into the common facts of experience to furnish a basis broad and strong enough to build on without constant recourse to *a-priori* assumptions. Just as Karl Marx was forced to be content with the Hegelian theory of evolution as a working hypothesis, Spinoza was forced to speculate. Modern metaphysicians, however, are at the best but pygmies compared to the great metaphysicians *malgré eux* of earlier days, and, what is still worse, have a far smaller excuse to offer for their productions. Neither Hume nor Kant,* Locke nor Fichte, are to be considered metaphysicians if we compare them to a Hegel or a Haeckel;—and few of the idealistic psychologists and philosophers of the present day, such men as Mach, Avenarius and Cohen, not to speak of the evolutionists, positivists and naturalists, have shown any alarming tendency to revert to the aeronautic speculations of by-gone times.

Now, if by the term metaphysical basis Mr. Chase meant a hypothesis or series of hypotheses founded on our knowledge of phenomena as given to us in experience,—hypotheses which are suggestive of new problems and from which we may work up to more comprehensive theories,—there is no particular reason why we should not agree with him, although he should not have replaced the metaphysical materialism which he combats by a form of idealism that is no less metaphysical; but if by a metaphysical basis he meant what we generally understand by the word metaphysical, namely, the pursuit of "absolute truth," of the "absolutely real as it exists for all intelligence" (Ferrier), involving speculations into the ultimate nature of phenomena on the ground of *a-priori* principles and preconceived ideas more or less arbitrarily assumed,—why, then, we cannot agree. Metaphysics as thus understood, and, as a matter of fact, metaphysics

*In regard to Kant's "transcendental" method Robert Adamson says in his *Fichte*, p. 112, note: "The term transcendental probably has, for English ears, an unpleasant ring, and will suggest metaphysical efforts to transcend experience. It must be understood, however, that transcendental method is simply the patient and rigorous analysis of experience itself. For any question or theorem which might pass beyond possible experience, Kant reserved the term transcendent; and the distinction, if not the mode of expressing it, is accepted by all his successors. Neither in Kant nor in Fichte is there anything in the slightest degree resembling what is commonly called metaphysics."

has long been understood in this sense, is much more nearly allied to theology than to philosophy; and however well adapted it may be to the purposes for which, as was indicated in the quotation from John Stuart Mill, it is employed to-day, it is certainly not suitable as a theoretical basis for either socialism or evolution.

It is indeed a matter of practical indifference to the theory of socialism how the statical problem of the universe is solved; we are not concerned with abstract investigations into the ultimate constitution either of matter or of force, but with the *mutual relations* of phenomena considered as such, chiefly, in fact, with the mutual relations of men; in short, our main interest lies in all questions which have a direct bearing on the practical affairs of human society. Such questions of ethical, social, political, economic and biological science and their accompanying theories are in no way dependent upon the assumptions of either idealists* or materialists; they are concerned not with the *statical*, but with the *dynamic* aspect of things: and in proportion as problems of vital interest arise, in proportion as we are called upon to take an active part in the creation of a new order of society, we must concentrate our attention upon those sciences which form the intellectual foundation of such action. Evolution is the branch of philosophy which treats of the dynamic as distinguished from the statistical aspect of phenomena, and it is from the point of view of evolution as applied to society that we must in last instance conduct our researches.

II.

In what relation, then, do the theories of socialism stand to philosophy? We have seen that it is the office of philosophy to investigate critically, systematize and supplement the results obtained in the various departments of scientific inquiry. Socialism is, in last instance, a conscious endeavor on the part of men to reorganize society on a collective basis, and, like all other highly organized activities, it stands in intimate connection with various theories—social, economic, ethical, historical and political—which serve in part as a guide to the practical labors of socialists, in part as a key to the historical significance of the movement. Now, the theories by which the practical activities of socialists are guided and explained are distributed, together with all other scientific theories, among the different branches of knowledge, which in turn are gradually being co-ordinated and

*Even Berkeley, who is popularly supposed to have denied the existence of the real and substantial in nature, Berkeley who started out with subjective and ended up with theological idealism, said, "I do not argue against the existence of any one thing that we can apprehend either by sense or reflexion. That the things I see with my eyes and touch with my hands do exist, really exist, I make not the least question."—*Principles of Human Knowledge*, Par. 39.

welded together by philosophy. The theories of socialism, therefore, stand in the same relation both to philosophy and to the other scientific theories as these to one another. Not all of the special sciences are directly connected with the theories of socialism: those treating more especially of the statical aspect of things; and others, including the majority of the natural sciences, the science of language, etc., are, indeed, a long distance removed from the specific field of socialist thought. Consequently we may expect the theories of socialism to have little if any direct modifying influence either on such sciences or on the philosophical problems which they involve; and it follows that, even apart from the fact that there can be only one philosophy, it is not only wrong to speak of a philosophy as being the peculiar property of socialism,*—philosophy not being the peculiar property of any individual or group of individuals,—but a mistake even to wish to burden ourselves, in so far as we are socialists and not philosophers, with what would be in part a most unprofitable luxury. On the other hand, as has already been indicated, socialism is most closely connected with certain branches of knowledge, which treat more especially of the dynamic aspect of things and are included under the general term of social science (economics, ethics, history, politics, law, demography, etc.) forming a distinct branch of philosophical inquiry. We have seen that the hypothesis which seeks to answer the dynamical problem of the universe is the theory of evolution; and the theory of evolution is in turn based on various fundamental natural laws,† such as causality, the conservation of energy, the continuity of motion, the indestructibility of matter, and the redistribution of matter and motion. These laws are neither materialistic nor idealistic; they are not founded upon the ultimate constitution of things, but upon the observed relations of phenomena. And the most important of them all, the keystone as it were of the entire edifice is the law of causal connection.

The theory of socialism,—that is to say, the theories of so-

*It need hardly be said that, what is sometimes known as the "socialist philosophy," is not philosophy at all in the strict sense of the term, but the general conception of life and of things social, historical, economic, ethical, and otherwise, which is shared to a greater or lesser degree by all socialists. That it is not what we mean now-a-days by philosophy, does not of course detract in the least from its value. Dietzgen's so-called socialist philosophy is a discussion of various philosophical problems from the standpoint of a socialist. The majority of these problems, however,—the theory of knowledge, causality, etc.—have no exclusive bearing on socialism, and have been discussed in much the same manner by philosophers who were not socialists. It is obvious that there can be nothing specifically socialistic in their interpretation. Finally it may be said that, although there is, properly speaking, no "socialist philosophy," there is at any rate, a philosophy of socialism; and this is the study, or science, which seeks to co-ordinate socialism, its theories and manifestations, with the other phenomena of human existence.

†Be it remembered that a natural law is a broad generalization based upon the facts of perception as registered in human experience. With these facts it must stand or fall. It may safely be left to the metaphysician to decide whether or not it is consistent with the facts which lie beyond human experience.

cialism taken as a whole,—is thus in last instance based on the evolutionary hypothesis,* and in special on that branch of evolution which is concerned with the development of human society. That there are many apparent contradictions between the theories of socialism and evolution as interpreted by non-socialist philosophers is largely due to the fact that scarcely anything has yet been accomplished towards the application of the theory of evolution to social problems, and to the subjective limitations under which its chief exponents have hitherto suffered; namely, their imperfect knowledge of economic science, their uncritical individualism, their incorrigible propensity to confuse collectivism with so-called state socialism, their anthropological and biological preconceptions,† and their palpable incompetence to deal with the facts of history. As it is, little more than a beginning has been made, and so far as I know, there has as yet been no serious attempt to work out the relations between the doctrines of socialism, including the materialistic conception of history, and the facts of evolution. The majority of the theorists of socialism are still too greatly under the influence of the Hegelian dialectic, or, as now seems to be the fashion, of Kant, and the evolutionists—whose thoughts generally run to biology rather than to the social sciences—as a rule know nothing of socialism.

We have thus seen that the various elements of socialist theory have to do with dynamic rather than static problems. Taken together they form a composite theory of human development, which, although far from having been worked out in all its details, is, like all other scientific theories, based on our experience of phenomena, in other words, on the facts of life. Philosophically considered, dynamic theories are as a whole grouped under the general heading of evolution, which is in turn

*Just now there is a wide-spread tendency for non-socialist speakers and writers to employ the terms evolution and revolution as mutually exclusive conceptions,—the one signifying a gradual process of unrolling and the other a sudden catastrophe. It is true that the process of evolution taken as a whole is gradual; it is no less true that it has been accompanied by sudden (local) changes and catastrophes without number, the significance of which can only be understood in their relation to the entire process. A volcanic eruption or the passage of a hurricane are no less a part of evolution than a social revolutionary upheaval. As a rule, the individual who places the terms revolution and evolution in antithesis with one another is merely a modern instance of Sydney Smith's famous Noodle, who was satisfied with things as they are and did not want to be precipitate. The object of revolutionary socialism is to establish society on a collective basis and to abolish the struggle for existence; in other words, to revolutionize society. Whether this process of revolution be swift or slow, violent or peaceful, whether it result to a greater or a lesser degree from the cumulative effects of gradual social changes, including reforms, or from a sudden seizure of the means of production by the entire people, it is no less a revolution than a part of the all-embracing process of evolution.

†That socialism is consistently opposed by many contemporary biologists is largely due to the popular belief that competition in the shape of a struggle for existence is essential to human progress. That the outcome of the industrial competition of to-day is the physical and moral deterioration of all concerned, and that this process of deterioration cannot be checked by such half-way measures as the erection of new hospitals and the enlargement of state prisons is a fact that is only slowly beginning to dawn upon their understandings.

a synthesis and criticism of all sciences which have to do with the dynamic aspect of things. It is the task of evolution to answer but one of the two great questions of philosophy; namely, to describe and to explain so far as is possible the universal process of transformation. It is not with the relation of knowledge to the problem of *being* but with its relation to the problem of *becoming* that we are here concerned. The elements in which we work must be accepted as realities; and all metaphysical questions as to the ultimate constitution of the materials in which evolution deals, or as to how the objective world manages to become a part of consciousness, may be set aside as belonging to another department of philosophical inquiry.

Evolution is the philosophy of the facts of life as presented to us in life. It is neither monism, dualism, nor pluralism; for whatever the attitude of men to the ultimate problems involved in these transcendental conceptions, it cannot alter the mutual relations of phenomena. The theoretical basis of evolution, in fact, the theoretical basis of all philosophy and science, is the law of causal connexion. Causality, when applied to human affairs, is called determinism; and in the following section I shall attempt to answer Mr. Chase's objections to this law.

III.

Although the constant dropping of water may in the course of ages wear away the hardest of stone, it is probable that more than mere drops of ink are required to disintegrate a time-honored fallacy. And when we consider all that has been written on determinism in the past, together with the many works that have appeared on the subject within recent years,* further comment would seem superfluous. Yet one cannot pass by in silence the statement that it is folly—to use Mr. Chase's words—for one who believes in determinism to put forth an effort of will, and much more to act, or that materialism carries within itself the seeds of its own destruction *because it is deterministic*. Let us say at once, that determinism is simply the law of causality applied to the actions of human beings, and that it has nothing to do with predestinarianism—a purely religious conception—as has often been pointed out, notably in the first chapter of Buckle, where the subject is treated at some length and a large number of authorities referred to. Nor is determinism fatalism. For although fatalists also set out from causal connexion and are thus fundamentally in agreement with determinists, they either neglect, or deny outright, such well-established facts of consciousness as

*Two very good books are *Das Problem der Willensfreiheit*, by Dr. Leo Muffelmann, Leipzig, 1902; and *Willensfreiheit, Zurechnung, und Verantwortung*, by Dr. Max Offner, Leipzig, 1904. So far as I know there are no recent works in English on the subject of determinism. A fairly good historical account of the problem is to be found in Bain's *Mental and Moral Science*.

conscience and the feeling of responsibility, holding them to be illusions, or, like the fatalists of the East, they turn philosophy into religion by the introduction of anthropomorphic and mystical elements, and thus deprive it of all scientific value.

The chief objections offered to determinism are, that it implies a mechanical conception of things and is apparently not to be reconciled with the fact that we are conscious of freedom. Of these two objections, the former may be set aside as trivial. Because machines, as we know them, as well as the machinery of inorganic nature in general, are presumably not gifted with either human or divine intelligence, it is supposed that the term mechanical when applied to organic life signifies a corresponding lack of intelligence and spontaneity in organisms. This is manifestly absurd, for the word mechanical simply means acting in accordance with natural law and is far from involving a denial of psychological phenomena. Moreover, our calling a thing mechanical does not mean that we understand it any better than if we called it by some other name; for the ultimate problems of force and motion, as encountered in the inorganic world, are apparently no nearer solution or less difficult of comprehension than the ultimate problems of human mind. Finally, the objection to the term mechanical is in nine cases out of ten an objection to natural law itself, and the prejudice against natural law is, as a rule, an outcome either of a preference for metaphysical speculations or a desire to grind a theological axe.

The feeling that we are free is another question. It is so often present in consciousness as to admit no doubt of its reality. An adequate explanation, however, is to be found in the fact that our motives (thoughts or feelings which lead to action) are not determined exclusively by objective forces and phenomena, but also by certain subjective psychological elements. These psychological elements, taken as a whole, are called character, or personality. They are relatively the most constant part of the ego, and in so far as our motives are determined by them, we can be said to act on our own initiative. For in such cases our actions may be determined, and are at the very least influenced, by psychological forces, which through long association have become an integral part of ourselves. On the other hand, that the will is far from being free in the orthodox metaphysical sense, follows from the fact that no man is responsible for his character, or personality, which is in part congenital, in part an outcome of the cumulative action and reaction of past experiences,—a result of the working of manifold forces over which the individual as such has no control.

Thus, while admitting the well-known facts of consciousness,

the determinist denies all theological and transcendental conceptions of free will and stands firmly upon natural law.*

This being the case, it may be asked, how is it, then, that we are able consciously and deliberately to attempt not only to alter social and political institutions, but also to take advantage of, and, in an increasing measure, to guide certain of the factors of social evolution? The answer to this question is, that every man has the power to transform his desires into conscious action, that, indeed, he must do so the moment his desires become motives, and there is no external force to prevent him. This is one of the commonest facts of experience. However, the real point at issue is not, are we able to exert will-power, but what gives direction to our will, by what is the will determined?—in other words, whence come our motives? Experience tells us that our motives are evidently a result of the reciprocal action of stimuli, generally coming from without, and character; and that in no case can motives be shown to be without antecedents. The stimulus may be an idea encountered in reading, which in turn awakens fresh impressions, or it may be a sensation giving rise to a sudden emotion, or a thought suggested by a speaker; in short, it may be anything that penetrates into the sphere of consciousness. But we are no less certain that personality is not a creation of the ego, in other words, of itself, than that we are not the creators of the stimuli upon which personality reacts. Yet we all have personality, and stimuli are thrust in upon us even in our sleep.

To say that it is folly for the determinist to act is absurd, considering that determinism is nothing more than a harmless scientific hypothesis which explains certain of life's phenomena, and as such prescribes no particular course of activity—or inactivity—to the individual. Indeed, the power to refrain from acting would under given conditions imply an independence of motives and personality, and consequently of natural law, which, far from being consistent with determinism, could only be explained by the metaphysical hypothesis of irresponsible free will!

That the sphere of conscious action is widening, that our conscious actions are becoming more and more efficient and better adapted to their ends—that we are getting a firmer and firmer grasp on our own destiny.—indeed, that the knowledge we have of evolution in its bearings on social questions is an important factor to this end, is no less true and no less consistent with the teachings of evolutionary science, than the fact that

*The will, if free, must be independent of the law of causality, that is to say, transcendental metaphysicians have long shown a preference for settling such questions as are dangerous to the interest of their preconceived dogmas to deny, yet impossible to demonstrate, by translating them from this world into the next,—a process of canonisation abundantly to be met with in the history of philosophy and religion.

what we call our destiny, important as it may be to us, is but the subjective side of a natural process, which, so far as we know, is absolute. Thus, although we may say that men have the capacity to co-operate with other forces in effecting changes in their environment, it is equally true that

"Nature is made better by no mean,
But nature makes that mean: over that art
Which you say adds to nature is an art
That nature makes"—

and that human experience knows no exception to this rule.

It is clear that the doctrine of theology, like that of freedom, when stripped of its metaphysical features, finally resolves itself into the identification of certain psychological elements with the ego, which psychological elements are, as we have already stated, a result of the action of forces which experience tells us are entirely beyond the control of the agent.

The question in which we socialists are most interested is not *are* we able to effect relative changes in our social and economic environment—a thing that nobody doubts—but *to what extent* can we consciously alter existing conditions, social and economic: what may be accomplished by the *direct* effects of conscious action, individual and collective, what part is played in social evolution by the *indirect* and *involuntary* effects of conscious action, and what part is played by the wholly unconscious in moulding our destiny? But to these questions no satisfactory reply can be given until an analysis of the factors of social evolution, more accurate and exhaustive than any that has so far been attempted, is placed at our disposal. And although Karl Marx, greatest of economists and sociologists, has presented us in his materialistic,* or economic, conception of history with a firm basis from which to set out on our further investigations, and at the same time has opened up to our view the immensity of the unconscious element in human development, we are still far from having arrived at a clear understanding of the relation which the dominant economic factor bears not only to the subordinate social forces, ideological and otherwise, with which it stands in reciprocal action, but also to our physical surroundings, the frame across which is stretched the very warp and woof of our existence.

However, it can safely be said, that with the gradual increase

*It need hardly be said that the materialistic conception of history has no necessary connexion with philosophical materialism. Whether Karl Marx and Friederich Engels were philosophical materialists, I do not know,—some authorities say they were and others that they were not, and the question seems so far to have received no very definite answer; but however this may be, the materialism or non-materialism of each was his own private affair,—a thing quite apart from their theory of history, which, like the theory of evolution with which it stands in such intimate relation, is concerned with matters dynamic and not statistical.

in our knowledge of social conditions, there is a corresponding development in our capacity to foresee the consequences of our actions, and with it a widening of the sphere of effective voluntary effort. And one very important reason for our supposing that the direct results of our political and economic action will be more considerable than have ever before been achieved in history, lies in the fact that the aim of socialism is not to destroy one class for the advantage of another class, but to break down all material class interests and distinctions for the benefit of the entire human race. We know not only that the involuntary and indirect results of the struggle of economic interests are a classic illustration of the past (and present) helplessness of capitalism and the ruling class in general to control even their *immediate* future, but also that the struggles themselves have from the earliest times supplied nourishment to all that is most primitive, irresponsible, and brutal in mankind. The moment society is organized on a basis of collectivism, the moment the merciless, deadening struggle for existence in economic and social life is replaced by co-operation and mutual aid, the greatest source of blind, ineffective action that history has ever known will be eliminated. It is not too much to say that its disappearance will mark the birth of a "new humanity."

HENRY BERGEN.

Munich, Ger.

A Statement and Denial.

SO untrue and unjust are recent press reports concerning my wife and myself, and so terribly false their implications as to socialist men and doctrines, that I feel compelled to give them an explicit public denial. Not that I have any hope of counteracting by means of a brief statement, the effects of wide misstatement that have occupied pages in our daily journals, and that have been read by millions of people. I can only hope that some of the serious-minded may read what I herein set forth, and accept it for the truth that it is:

1. According to these reports, Mrs. Herron and myself have recently inherited from her mother, Mrs. E. D. Rand, eleven millions of dollars, all of which sum is to be devoted to the destruction of the family and of religion. Now, Mrs. Rand never had eleven million dollars, nor one million dollars to bequeath to any one. Her whole estate does not amount to one-twelfth of what the press reports her to have left to her daughter. And the bulk of that twelfth does not go to Mrs. Herron at all but is held by trustees to be equally divided among Mrs. Rand's six grandchildren as they respectively become twenty-eight years of age, during which time one-half of the income is to be devoted to the founding of a school of socialism in New York city, with Mrs. Herron and Mr. Morris Hillquit as its trustees.

2. It is stated that there is gathered at Elmwood Farm, our home near Metuchen, New Jersey, a colony of people who are putting in practice the supposed doctrines that are destructive to the family and to religion. There is not, there has not been, nor has there been any intention or dream of having, a colony of any sort whatsoever at the Elmwood Farmstead. The place was an old and neglected colonial farm, which we bought four years ago, in the first place, as a home for my father and mother, who are conservative Presbyterians and Republicans, and also are the only people who have lived on the place, aside from the superintendent and employes. We also thought of the homestead and land as a place where we could work out of doors in the summer months, while giving hospitality to friends in need of rest, and while making a piece of practically waste earth fruitful and beautiful again. The only cottages on the place are those occupied by the farmer, the mechanic and the gardener. The persistent story of a colony at Elmwood Farm is pure invention and neither in fact nor intention has such a colony ever existed. It is to be hoped that this statement will forever set the matter at rest.

3. It is reported that I and my "followers" are engaged in a crusade against marriage, and that I am writing a book, to be published in all lands and all languages, that is meant for the destruction of the family. I am not writing, and never expect to write any such book nor am I engaged in any crusade against the family. In the real sacredness of the real family none of our accusers believe so devoutly as my wife and myself. One of our complaints against a capitalist civilization is that it is destroying both the economic and sympathetic basis on which the family can alone be built. The only crusade upon which I have been engaged is that of the working class for its emancipation from a capitalist society that I believe to be already rotten to the heart and brazen in every feature. Furthermore, I never had, never sought, and would not consent to have "followers" of any kind whatsoever. I am myself but an humble and unimportant follower of the International Socialist movement for the overthrow of the hideous and depraved capitalism which at present dooms the people of all nations to slavery, misery and hypocrisy.

4. For the millionth time, it is reported that Mrs. Herron and I took each other for "companions" nearly four years ago, and that we were not duly and legally married. This again is unqualified and malign invention. No such expressions as those used by the press, and by certain sordid novels, were ever used. We were married legally and even conventionally. The only thing in which the marriage differed from any marriage service, was that the clergyman used the word "announce" instead of "pronounce," and that each of the friends present was asked to express some chosen sentiment as a part of the ceremony.

Finally, it is only after painful and reluctant consideration that I send out this statement. In the unimaginable falsehood and warfare to which my wife and I have been subjected, for now more than four years, whenever our names have been publicly mentioned, I have made no reply and no defense. Nor is this mere statement of facts a defense of anything that we are, or do, or teach. In the end, it is only the lives of men or women, and the truth that is in them, that can defend them and if the truth of their lives cannot justify them, then nothing else can and if the truth cannot finally care for its own, then the world has no justice to give that is worth having. Besides, it seems to me that the manner by which my wife and I were married, and the things I am supposed to teach, have occupied a place in the public press, and, hence, in the public mind, out of all proportion to their significance. What I do, or do not, what I teach or do not teach, is very unimportant, and it is humiliating to be forced to assume them to be important enough to demand a defense against injustice and misstatement. And it is only out of deference to the cause of Socialism to which such life as I have belongs that I

put forth this correction in order that the Socialist movement and its doctrines may not be misread in the light in which I have been presented to the people by the reports referred to. While not expecting for a moment that this statement can efface the long effect of evil report from the popular mind, I can at least hope that facts herein given may have weight with some, and that there is still enough fairness in the press to allow me to set forth this much of truth against the volumes of unthinkable falsehood that have appeared. I furthermore hope that this statement may be accepted as final, especially as my wife and I are leaving to make our home indefinitely in a foreign land.

GEORGE D. HERRON.

Surplus Value and its Division.

WE HAVE seen in the last article that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which society will necessarily have to expend for its reproduction. This applies to all commodities, including that peculiar commodity upon which the whole capitalist system rests—labor power. All the mystery surrounding the production and distribution of the capitalist system, which we have noted above, is due to the presence of this peculiar commodity which was absolutely unknown to any former system of society. In no social system before the advent of capitalism was human labor power an independent commodity which could be trafficked in the market. A man's labor-power was deemed such an intimately personal attribute that it could not be considered apart from the man himself. The man himself might be free or unfree. If he was free his labor power was his own, used by himself for himself. If he was unfree, he, including his labor-power with his other personal attributes, belonged to his master. But in either case his labor power was inseparable from his body, was part and parcel of his personality as much as his personal appearance, and went with it.

It was only with the advent of capitalism that a man's labor power became separated from his body and person, when his labor power was "abstracted" from his personality and gained an independent existence. Then human labor power "as such," human labor power in the abstract, human labor power unidentified by an individual characteristic and severed from any *personal* relation, became an independent commodity to be trafficked in the open market. It is the appearance of this commodity historically that made capitalism possible, and it is due to its peculiar nature that so much mystery surrounds the workings of that system, upon which it has indelibly stamped its own characteristics.

The new commodity of *abstract* human labor, bought and sold in the open market independent and irrespective of any individual or personal relation, is, at the same time, part and parcel of the commodities which constitute the stock-on-hand of the capitalist world as well as the source of all the other commodities on hand. It is also its own source and creator, being the means of its own reproduction. As the general source and creator of capitalistic commodities, this abstract human labor is the source, and therefore, the measure of the exchange value of those commodities. As its own source and reproducer it is its own source and measure of value. That is to say, the measure of the value

of the capitalist commodity "general human labor power" is the amount of this labor power necessary for its reproduction under the social conditions of production existing at the time when it is dealt in on the market. This dual position of the commodity general human labor power is what has mystified and baffled the investigators into the laws of production and distribution of capitalist society. When this dual position is properly understood the mystery vanishes, and the anatomy and physiology, as well as the psychology of capitalist society are revealed to the mind's eye, so that their construction and *modus operandi* can be studied in detail.

We have seen already that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of labor which will necessarily have to be expended in its production. This amount of labor will have to be bought in the open market by the producer in the shape of labor power, potential labor, and he will have to pay for it, barring accidents, *its* value. That is to say, he will have to pay the value of the labor necessary to produce this labor power, or, in other words, he will have to pay, in the form of wages, the amount of goods which the laborer consumes while exerting his labor power. This amount will vary, of course, with the productivity of labor in general, and with the standard of living of the workmen. But it will invariably be less than the amount of goods produced by the laborer in this exertion of his labor power. This is a prerequisite not only of capitalist production, but of any social form of production wherein a part only of the members of society are actively engaged in the work of production. In other words, in our capitalist system where a man sells his labor power to another man for a certain number of hours every day in consideration of a certain wage, the amount of labor necessary in order to produce the product represented by his wage is always smaller than the total amount of labor which he sold to his employer. As general human labor can only be measured by the time during which the labor power was exerted, it is the same thing as saying that the time required to produce a man's wages is always shorter than the time for which he was hired by the payment of these wages.

The amount of labor spent in reproducing the product which goes to the laborer as his wages may be called "necessary labor," for the reason that it is absolutely necessary in order to make further production or even existence itself on the same plane possible. The amount of labor, on the other hand, which the laborer puts in above the "necessary labor" we may call "surplus labor," for the reason that it is an overplus or addition to the amount of "necessary labor" which the laborer had already put in. The product which is produced in the "necessary labor" time, and its value may, for the same reasons be called "necessary" product,

and its value—"necessary" value; and the product produced in the "surplus labor" time, and its value—"surplus" product or value. In using the words "necessary" and "surplus" in characterizing the different parts of labor, product, or value, we do not intend to convey any meaning of praise or justification in the case of the one, nor of condemnation or derogation in the case of the other. We use them in their purely technical sense, with absolutely no "ethical" or "appreciative" significance.

This *surplus value* being constantly produced by the commodity labor power which the capitalists engaged in production constantly employ in their business, is the secret and mysterious source of all the wealth and revenue which falls to the share of those classes of capitalist society, who, without producing themselves, and without either by force or cunning appropriating to themselves what others produced, are still found in possession of quite a considerable share of the worldly goods of our society. Because of the peculiar faculty of the commodity labor-power to produce a surplus-product representing surplus-value, the *capitalist class* is enabled to obtain a part of the annual product of society without *taking* it from the producers.

When, at the end of a day, week, month, or year, the manufacturer is in possession of the finished product, that product contains the "necessary" as well as the "surplus" value. In the "necessary" value is included not only the wages paid to the workingmen but also the "capital" that went into the product, or rather, that part of capital which Marx calls "constant," that is to say, raw material, machinery charges, etc. Of course, all these things at one time, when they were produced, represented "necessary" as well as "surplus" value; when they are used, however, in production, that part of the product which simply reproduces their value is "necessary" for the same reason that the part representing the wages is "necessary." The "surplus" which he finds himself thus possessed of is therefore a clear *surplus* over and above all his expenditures and investment. It is pure *revenue* or *profit*. The amount of the surplus-value produced, and therefore of the revenue or profit derived by the manufacturer, depends, aside from the mere length of the working day, as already stated, on the state of the productivity of labor in general and the mode of living of the workingmen. That is to say, on the proportion of the "necessary" to the "surplus" in the labor performed by the laborer during the period of his employment. The length of the work day given, the productivity of labor, and the mode of living of the workingmen affect this proportion in opposite directions: a higher mode of living increases the "necessary" part of the labor, and higher productivity its "surplus" part.

After the surplus value is produced by the laborer in the surplus time that he works, the fund from which the capitalist

class as a class derives its revenue and "saves" its wealth is ready for its use and it becomes merely a question of its distribution among the different members of the class. This distribution is no simple matter, as it is done for the most part without the participants meeting each other, often without their knowledge, and always without their consent. This distribution is accomplished by the laws governing capitalist production, and automatically. In so far, of course, as such distribution is according to rule, normal. There is always, however, the possibility of one capitalist getting the better of the other, and the individual capitalist invariably attempts to do so. Whether or no these attempts are successful makes, however, no difference in this connection, as was already shown at length above. It is the *rule* of capitalist society that we are concerned with. The problem that confronts us, therefore, is: how does that part of the surplus value which, after its production by the workingmen, is in the possession of the manufacturer, find its way into the hands of the other members of the capitalist class?

As was already indicated above, all value, and therefore also surplus value—is not realized until the product which is the embodiment of the value reaches its ultimate destination, the consumer, who takes it out of the market, disregards its exchange-value and enjoys its use-value. Before it has reached this, its ultimate destination, a commodity, while possessing exchange value possesses it only potentially. Exchange value, not being something intrinsically inherent in the commodity, but expressing merely a social relation of production and distribution, may at any time before its final realization, when it ceases to be exchange value, be adversely affected by some social change. We have already seen that the exchange value of a thing is the amount of labor necessary for the *reproduction*, at the time when it is needed, that is to say, when it reaches the consumer. Before it has reached the consumer its exchange value is always liable to change. There is therefore really no telling what the surplus value contained in a commodity is until it has reached the consumer. It cannot reach the consumer, however, before it has gone through the process of circulation in which it is being bought and sold, that is, exchanged. In all these transactions its exchange value, as the same expresses itself in the price which it fetches, is estimated upon the basis of its exchange value when it finally reaches its economic goal.

In this process of circulation the surplus value contained in the product, as far as the persons connected in its division are concerned, is realized by piecemeal. Each party concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity until it fulfills its social mission gets his share of the surplus value therein contained when it leaves his hands, on a sale by him, and the pur-

chase price which he receives represents the "necessary" part of the value of the commodity together with the share of the surplus value thereof to which he and those who preceded him in the process are entitled. In this way the surplus product contained in a commodity when it is produced is gradually converted into surplus value as it "circulates" along, and the surplus value is taken up gradually as it is being realized, share by share, along its course. The division of the surplus value takes place in the circulation process, and expresses itself in the different prices at which it is sold in this process.

These different prices at which a commodity is sold at different stages of the circulation process seemed to us inexplicable before, and vexed us not a little. But they will be readily understood when we know that the sharing up of the surplus value takes place in this process. As each stage of the process is passed a share of the surplus value is realized and is added to its price. When the exchange value of a commodity is first realized, when the manufacturer sells it, it is only that part of its exchange value that is realized, and is expressed in the price which the manufacturer obtained for it, which represents the "necessary" value of the commodity and that part of its surplus value which the manufacturer receives as his profit. The merchant pays his price to the manufacturer knowing that the full surplus value contained in the commodity has not yet been realized and expecting to realize a further share thereof for his own benefit upon a resale of the commodity to the retailer or consumer. This does actually happen in the usual course of business. This operation is repeated until the commodity passes the necessary stages of its circulation and reaches its social destination—the consumer—when the full surplus value contained in the commodity is realized in the purchase price paid by the consumer. This price represents the full value of the commodity "necessary" as well as "surplus."

The rules in accordance with which the different "interests" share in the surplus-value, and in accordance with which the different prices are paid for the commodity at the successive stages of the circulation process are themselves the result of the peculiar nature of the capitalist system stamped upon it by the peculiar commodity which lies at its foundation—labor power. The profit-sharing of the capitalist class is therefore absolutely impersonal. It also requires absolute freedom of movement for the different elements which go into the process of production and distribution. Wherever there is no absolute freedom of movement the laws governing the division of the surplus-value among the different capitalists are interfered with arbitrarily and may even be abrogated. This is a necessary corollary to the observation already made that all the laws of value and consequently the production

and realization of the surplus-value require absolute freedom of movement.

The presence in the market of the laborer offering for sale his labor power presupposes the presence in the same market of the capitalist seeking employment for his capital. Labor power as a commodity presupposes that the laborer who has this power for sale is not in possession of the tools of production necessary in order to exercise this power in the process of production. It presupposes a high state of technical development of production. Such a state of development that the productivity of labor is considerably above that stage where it can merely reproduce itself, yielding a large surplus-value, and that a large portion of the surplus value must be "saved" for the purpose of being used as a means of future production. It also presupposes that the "saved" portions of the surplus-value produced in the past are not in the hands of the laborers who offer for sale their labor-power. The possessors of these "saved" portions of past surplus-values, the capitalists, use these "savings," *capital*, in the production of further surplus-value, by the aid of the labor power which they purchase for part of it, in order to take it all to themselves. It is not, however, the capitalist personally who acquires the surplus-value. Capital, congealed and concentrated surplus-profit, produced by labor power, is just as impersonal, just as abstract, as its parent, labor-power. It is capital *as such*, irrespective of the capitalist who owns it, that gobbles up all the surplus value. The capitalist personally may sometimes by his ingenuity cause his capital to produce some extra surplus-value which other, less ingenious, capitalists could not do. In that even it goes to him personally as an extra profit. The ordinary, regular profits, however, of capitalist production and trade go to the credit of the capital employed, not the capitalist personally.

In order to produce a certain commodity and realize its value, that is bring it to the ultimate consumer and obtain from him its price, a certain amount of capital must necessarily be employed for a certain length of time. The amount of capital necessary to be employed therein at the different periods of the processes of production and circulation, and for how long a time at each period, will vary, of course, with the state of development of the means of production and exchange, including the means of transportation and communication and other facilities for the circulation of commodities in any given society at any given time. But under given conditions of production and circulation the amounts of, and lengths of time for which capital is necessarily employed in order to produce a commodity and bring it to the consumer remain the same.

We have already seen before that while all the surplus-value

contained is produced in the process of the commodity's production while it is in the possession of the manufacturer, this surplus-value is divided among all the capitalists who are concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity, while the same remains in the circulation process. Strictly speaking, however, as was already observed before, the surplus-value is not divided among the different capitalists concerned in the production and circulation of the commodity, but among the different capitalists employed in these two processes through which the life-course of each commodity runs. The distributive share of each of these capitals in the surplus value is proportionate to its own size and the length of time it was necessarily employed in either the production or the circulation of the commodity. That is to say, the total amount of capital, measured by a given unit, say a dollar, employed during all the time, measured by a given unit, say a day, that the commodity was necessarily in the process of production and circulation, is footed up, and the amount of surplus-value contained in the commodity is divided by that total, giving a certain amount of surplus-value per unit of capital per unit of time, which we will call the rate of profit. The distributive share of each capital is, then, the product of its own size \times the time it was employed \times the rate of profit.

When the manufacturer sells the commodity, at its first appearance as a commodity and the first realization of its value, the price which he receives and in which his value is realized, is not its final price expressing its actual value when it is ready to perform its full social function in the hands of the consumer. It is merely an intermediate price, Marx calls it "Price of production." This intermediary price is based on the ultimate price of the commodity to be received from the consumer in accordance with its value. It is by this expected ultimate price representing its full value that the amount of surplus-value contained in it is ascertained. When the fact that the commodity contains a surplus-value and its amount are ascertained, the Price of Production is determined by the "necessary" value contained in it plus the distributive share of the manufacturer's capital in the surplus-value. The "necessary" value contained in the commodity represents the cost of its production to the manufacturer. That does not mean, however, that the manufacturer simply gets a return of what he has expended in the production of the commodity. It is not the *actual* expense of production that is represented in its "necessary" value, but the *socially necessary* expense of producing the commodity at the time the manufacturer sells it. If the actual cost of production is above that the manufacturer loses the difference; if it is below he pockets the difference as an extra profit.

The prices paid at any succeeding stage of the circulating process are fixed in the same way. Each succeeding seller gets in the price which he receives the necessary value of the commodity plus the distributive share of the surplus-value to which he and his predecessors in the process are entitled in accordance with the rules formulated above. Each of them gets his own distributive share of the surplus-value in addition to what he has paid or laid out. Provided, of course, he bought and sold at its fair price. Otherwise, one of them may get more than his due share and another less. But all of the capitalists concerned, together, get all the surplus-value produced in the process of production, and no more. Unless, indeed, the workingmen did not get their fair pay or the consumer was compelled to pay an unfair price, in which event the capitalists immediately concerned reaped an extra profit. Or the workingmen were paid too much or the consumer paid too little, in which event the capitalists immediately concerned suffered a loss.

It was assumed all through this discussion that each capitalist worked with his own capital. If any one of them did not, he had to give up all or part of his share of the surplus-value, which he received in the form of profit, to the person from whom he borrowed his capital, in the shape of interest. This does not change the matter, however, and we are not concerned with it here. We also left out of the discussion the question of rent, and the question of additional work which may have to be performed on the commodity in the circulation process, as these questions in no wise affect the subject-matter of our investigation,—the laws governing the production of wealth in the capitalist system and the manner of its distribution among the different classes of capitalist society.

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)

Public Defense in Criminal Trials.

IT is an axiom of the law that a person charged with crime is presumed to be innocent until found guilty. And yet society does all it can to convict him but almost nothing to secure for him an adequate defense. In the trial of such a person the prosecution is conducted by a public prosecutor employed by the state. This manner of prosecution has grown out of the belief that crimes are wrongs of so public a character that society has the right to prosecute the criminals.

But the defendant at the bar is forced to provide for his own defense. He, a single individual, must defend himself against the state, representing many individuals. If he is a Roland B. Molyneux, with thousands of dollars at his command, all may be well with him. Like Molyneux he may be able, even after the death sentence has been pronounced upon him, to appeal his case once, twice or three times, and, with the aid of the best legal talent, finally to secure an acquittal. But, on the contrary, he may be like the defendant in the following case.

An old woman was found dead in her home. Upon her body were marks which indicated a violent death. Circumstantial evidence caused suspicion to rest upon her husband, an old man of seventy, and he was arrested under the charge of murder in the first degree. In the city where this took place lawyers assigned by judges to defend pauper cases received no pay except in cases of murder in the first degree, for the defense of which there was a fee of five hundred dollars. A "shyster" lawyer who knew that this old man was too poor to employ counsel went to the judge and secured the assignment to the case. But the grand jury returned an indictment for manslaughter in the first degree. Since he could not hope for a fee for defending the old man against this charge the lawyer at once lost his interest in the case. In order to avoid the labor of trying the case he began to press the defendant to plead guilty. The old man refused, protesting his innocence. But the lawyer was helped by a long delay in bringing the case to trial because the public prosecutor found difficulty in securing enough evidence to ensure a conviction. This official was fond of boasting that he had already sent eighteen men to the electric chair. It gave him great pain to witness the acquittal of a single person charged with crime. He therefore delayed this trial in the hope of finding further evidence of this man's guilt. The presumption of the law that this man was innocent did not deter him from causing this delay.

Day after day the poor old man sat in his cell and brooded over the death of his wife. For nearly fifty years they had lived together and loved one another. So great was his grief at her death that he had wept beside her grave. And yet these representatives of the law accused him of having killed her. These accusations he met with indignant denial. When the lawyer whose duty it was to defend him suggested that he plead guilty he spurned the suggestion with vehemence. But the close confinement and rigid discipline of the prison rapidly weakened his courage and his strength. He knew that the public prosecutor was doing his best to convict him. His own lawyer was constantly pressing him to plead guilty. The hand of the law had its iron grip upon him and from it he saw no escape. For six months the ordeal continued. At last, broken in body and in spirit, he consented to plead guilty. The judge directed a probation officer to investigate the case. This investigation revealed facts which proved that the old man could not possibly have killed his wife. It was shown that her death was caused by a strange and unusual accident. When the judge learned these facts he directed that the plea of guilty be withdrawn and that there be a trial by jury. After verifying the facts presented by the probation officer the public prosecutor concluded that a conviction was impossible. He therefore asked that the defendant be discharged on his own recognizance. With trembling limbs the old man walked from the courtroom where he had so narrowly escaped receiving punishment. Were it not for the almost accidental investigation of the probation officer he would probably have been sentenced to twenty years imprisonment for a crime he had never committed. To have served a small part of this sentence would undoubtedly have killed him.

This story is but a single example of what is constantly occurring in the criminal courts. It shows that the present method of official defense is little better than a farce. When a defendant lacks the means with which to employ counsel it becomes the duty of the judge to instruct a lawyer practising in his court to take charge of the defense. What is the usual result? This lawyer officially appointed the counsel for the defense ascertains from the defendant his financial resources. His object is to determine whether there is any possibility of securing a fee for the services which it is his duty to perform. If there is no such possibility his wish is to dispose of the case with as little trouble as possible. To do this he tries, first of all, to persuade the defendant to plead guilty. If he succeeds he is relieved from the necessity of spending time and trouble in conducting the trial. The defendant, however, may protest his innocence and insist upon a trial. The lawyer will then give to the preparation for the trial as little time as possible. He gives to the defendant a poor and

weak defense in opposition to the carefully prepared prosecution of the prosecuting attorney. Thus great injustice is done to the defendant who is so unfortunate as to be unable to employ counsel. Many such defendants will plead guilty rather than be tried with so poor a defense.

To prevent such grave injustice a system of public defense should be established. Lawyers employed by the state as public advocates should conduct this defense. No person prosecuted for crime, who is too poor to employ counsel, would then lack efficient defense. Such legal officers called "advocates of the poor" used to exist in certain Italian provinces. It was their duty to act as counsel in all pauper cases. Unfortunately these offices were abolished at the time of the political reorganization of Italy. Enrico Ferri, the great Italian criminal sociologist, strongly favors their re-establishment. He says that these advocates "ought to be on a par with the public prosecutor," and to be substituted for the present institution of the official defense, which is a complete failure."

These advocates would stand ready to defend in all cases where the defendants are unable to employ counsel. But there are many reasons for extending this system of public defense to all criminal trials. To fully appreciate the force of these reasons it is necessary first of all to understand the theory underlying public prosecution. This theory has grown out of the belief that crimes are wrongs of a very public character. To protect itself against them society has assured the right to prosecute the criminals. Therefore, whenever a person charged with crime is brought before a court, the prosecution is conducted by an attorney employed by the state. Society does all it can to secure the conviction of the defendant. But it does little or nothing to secure for him an adequate defense. And yet it is true that criminals are created by society. If, therefore, society to protect itself has the right to prosecute them, they certainly have the right to demand of society a fair defense. And what of those innocent victims of public prosecution who are so many of the defendants in criminal trials. They have undergone suffering, humiliation and the loss of time and money by being forced to stand trial for the commission of crimes of which they are ultimately acquitted. In recompense for this they have the right to demand indemnification from society. The least that society can do for them is to provide them with adequate defense. And yet they are left entirely to their own resources to secure this defense. If they lack such resources they are given the existing form of official defense. This, as we have seen, is an utter failure.

This system of public defense in all criminal trials would make it much easier to abolish the present vicious method of allowing defendants to plead guilty. It would at least remove the worst

feature of this method. This feature of court procedure exists for the sake of expediting the business of the court. But it has resulted in a number of very grave abuses. A defendant in a criminal trial is brought before the bar and asked whether he wishes to plead guilty. Many defendants, through ignorance of court procedure, or, in the case of immigrants, of the English language, are incapable of understanding this question. It frequently happens that one of these, who is not represented by counsel, will answer affirmatively to this question. He will plead guilty without any intention of making such a plea. I have had the opportunity frequently of talking with prisoners who had thus unwittingly pleaded guilty. In the case of many of these, who still believed that they were to be tried, I have had the unpleasant task of informing them that all that was left for them now was the pronouncing of their sentence by the judge. Thus we see that it is possible under our present system of criminal procedure for a defendant to plead guilty unintentionally. This can happen because the defendant does not have adequate representation in the court. If a public advocate could have charge of the defense this could never happen.

On the other hand experienced criminals when charged with crime frequently take advantage of this method of pleading guilty. They will plead guilty with the utmost alacrity in order to secure the benefit of the leniency shown by the law and by judges as a reward. I was recently talking with a notorious criminal who has already spent four terms in state prisons of two states. He told me that it was his habit to plead guilty in order to secure the benefit of such leniency. He then began boasting of the short sentences he had served. It often happens that a first offender who has stood trial and been convicted will receive a longer sentence than an old offender who has pleaded guilty to the same crime. Such grotesque mistakes as these would rarely happen if a trial were held in each case. During the course of the trial the past record of each defendant would be thoroughly exposed in open court. It would then be possible to judge and to sentence, not only according to the nature of the crime, but also according to the character and past record of the criminal. Public defense would make it much more feasible to have a trial in every case because the public advocates would be ready to prepare carefully the defense. Thus each defendant would be certain of a fair trial.

This method of pleading guilty tempts a public prosecutor to urge a defendant to plead guilty. He does this in order to save himself the time and trouble of prosecuting the case. He may threaten the defendant with unusually severe punishment if he insists upon a trial. Or he may offer to allow him to plead guilty to a lesser crime than the one with which he is charged. Or he

may offer to ask the judge for great leniency if the defendant will plead guilty. As a result poor and ignorant defendants are frequently frightened or coerced into pleading guilty. No defendant should be made to feel that he is jeopardizing his interests by insisting upon a trial. By means of threats innocent persons have often been induced to plead guilty. Offers of leniency have helped notorious criminals to get off with less punishment than they deserved. The public advocate could shield the innocent defendant from the threat of the prosecuting attorney. A trial in each case would insure the meting out of adequate punishment to the criminal.

This system of public defense would almost entirely eliminate the so-called "shyster" lawyers. The harm sometimes done by these "shysters" is shown in the case of the old man charged with the murder of his wife. These creatures haunt every criminal court and prey upon poor and ignorant defendants, oftentimes bleeding them of all their property. The presence of many such defendants favors the existence of these lawyers. The precarious situation of these defendants makes them their easy prey. With public defense, however, all such cases of poor and ignorant defendants would be in the hands of the public advocate. Thus the field of action of the "shyster" lawyer would be destroyed.

The public advocate could do much more far-reaching work than the probation officer. This officer exists in certain of the courts of the states where probation or parole laws have been passed. His work is to prevent some of the abuses which have been described. As a rule he can have nothing to do with a case until the defendant has been convicted or has pleaded guilty. He is then directed by the judge to investigate the case. Having gathered as much information as possible he reports to the judge. He may also make some recommendation as to the best method of disposing of the case. Where the prisoner seems to have been convicted unjustly or where leniency seems desirable he recommends leniency. He may thus prevent to a very small extent some of the abuses which exist. But he is very much limited in his powers and his opportunities. His work is done in a more or less haphazard and incidental sort of a way and his success depends upon the judges under whom he is working. He is usually unable to influence a case until after the greatest injury has been done. Even then he is only able to alleviate in a slight degree the effects of this injury. The public advocate, on the contrary, would have charge of a case from the very beginning. He could almost entirely prevent all of the abuses which have been described. He would not allow a defendant to plead guilty unintentionally. He could prevent the conviction of innocent persons caused by the lack of efficient defense by lawyers appointed by the judge. The work of investigating the past record of pris-

oners about to be sentenced, now done by probation officers, could be done as well by the public advocate. In most cases he would already have made this investigation while conducting the trial. The public advocate would thus become the logical successor of the probation officer. He would supplement if not entirely supersede him in his work of mitigating the harshness of the law in cases where leniency is desirable.

The public advocate could frequently prevent long delays in bringing cases to trial. These delays are usually caused by the public prosecutor who is looking for further evidence of guilt. The public advocate could in the meantime be searching for evidence of innocence, and could demand a trial as soon as he had obtained this evidence. How different might have been the story of the old man charged with the murder of his wife. If a public advocate could have conducted the defense he would soon have had the evidence of innocence which was found so much later by the probation officer. He would then have demanded a trial, with with the aid of this evidence, would have secured the acquittal of the old man. But the lawyer appointed by the judge was unwilling to take the time and trouble to find this evidence. In the meantime the old man was suffering the terrible ordeal of those long months in prison, which forced him finally to plead guilty. It was not until then that the probation officer was able to do the investigating which resulted in the release of the old man. Delay in the bringing of a case to trial is a great injustice to the defendant, especially if he is unable to give bail and is forced to wait in prison. The public advocate, by securing evidence of innocence, could in many cases prevent such delay.

The introduction of this system of public defense would probably meet much opposition from the bar. And yet from the point of view of the bar associations it should be favored. To be sure it would destroy the practice of the "shyster" lawyers. Many positions as public advocates would be created which should go to the better class of lawyers. Furthermore, a certain amount of the better kind of criminal practice would still remain. Public defense would not necessarily destroy all criminal practice for private lawyers. Defendants could still have the privilege of employing private counsel if they so desired. It is impossible to determine at present whether it would ever be well for the public advocate to allow a case to go entirely out of his hands. It might be well for him to have supervision in every case. The private counsel could then co-operate with him in conducting the trial. But public defense would tend to purify private criminal practice. It would eliminate the disreputable class of lawyers and the disreputable kinds of practice. But it would leave a large field for honorable and dignified practice, either as a public advocate or as a private counsellor.

Public defense would greatly increase the amount of recognition given to the defendant in a criminal trial. In this respect it would be in accord with the historical development of criminal procedure. In England, as late as 1836, no person prosecuted for any felony, except treason, had even the right to employ his own counsel. All those prosecuted for crime now have the privilege of securing their own counsel. It is now time for society to recognize its duty of providing efficient defense in every criminal trial. Under the present system of criminal procedure many innocent individuals have been sacrificed in the name of society. The object of this system is to check crime. And yet it breeds many criminals, for to punish innocent individuals is, as a rule, to make them criminals. Thus not only has great injustice been done to those sacrificed, but society also has suffered. With public defense the great majority of these would be acquitted and saved to society.

Public defense would also increase the amount of attention given to the criminal. To protect itself against crime society has developed criminal law and the machinery to enforce it. It has administered punishment according to the nature of the crime, but has almost entirely ignored the criminal. By so doing it has encouraged rather than suppressed criminal instincts. Occasional criminals are those who have committed crime more through misfortune or accident than through criminal instinct. Many men belonging to the great army of the unemployed steal to save themselves and their families from starvation. To send these men to prison is to make many of them confirmed criminals. In the meantime their families are left in greater destitution, thus increasing the temptation of the members of these families to commit crime. Many are tempted to commit crime by evil associates. These may be saved to society by the exercise of leniency. And yet in most of these cases through lack of efficient defense severe punishment is administered. By means of public defense each one of these criminals would receive a fair hearing in the court. Such punishment could then be meted out as would tend to increase criminal instincts. By so doing, not only would society be performing its duty of securing justice to these individuals, but would also be protecting itself against crime in the future.

If, then, we introduce a system of public defense, public advocates would stand ready to defend every person charged with crime whether guilty or innocent. No other single change in criminal procedure would do more to save the innocent person and the occasional criminal from an undeserved or a too severe punishment. Through the public advocate every person prosecuted for crime would have a full and fair opportunity to present to the court his past record, his character, and the circumstances under which he was charged to have committed crime. Thus the court

would be able to judge, not only according to the technically legal character of the crime, but also according to those far more important personal factors which should be considered in the decision of every criminal case.

MAURICE F. PARMELEE.

This plan of having paid public "defenders" as well as prosecutors has been adopted as a part of the public policy of nearly all European socialist parties and some of them include it in their platforms. While such a measure does not strike at the root of class justice, yet it offers so great an improvement on our present judicial procedure as to be well worth the attention of socialists.—EDITOR.

EDITORIAL

Government by Mimeograph.

We have had many exemplifications of government by injunction in the course of our industrial warfare, and from present developments it looks as though the socialist party was rapidly coming to be governed or at least administered by the mimeograph. Perhaps this is only one more illustration of the way in which a mechanical invention transforms institutions. The fatal facility with which a number of copies can be run off on this new invention practically makes every man his own newspaper and has led to a tremendous multiplication of "protests," "statements," "explanations," "suggestions," etc.

So long as this was confined to individuals who took their own time and paid their own expenses it was certainly nothing of which any one else could complain. But now that an attempt is being made to have the national office of the socialist party become the medium by which all these various effusions shall be prepared and distributed it is time for the membership of that organization, whose time and money is being so used, to protest.

It is probable that few even of the members of the national committee realize that nearly one third of the resources of the national office is now being used in sending out voluminous publications to a few party officials. So far has this now gone that to a large degree the national organization resembles the majority of the village churches in that it only lives to keep itself alive.

An examination of a late batch of mimeographed stuff shows that out of 21 pages, not over eight are devoted to matters which properly belong there. In addition to this matter a special circular has also been printed in order to give the various members of the quarreling organizations of Minnesota and intermeddling members from other states an opportunity to voice their very important opinions. Taken all together this costs each year far more than any weekly paper published by the socialists, with one single exception.

The question comes up as to what right these few persons have to

use the time and money of all of us to air their opinions on party matters, simply by sending any communications to be published "by request."

Nearly all of these communications have previously appeared in some party paper and in that way have already reached the membership. If these members are so anxious to air their valuable opinions let them send them to the various papers some of which are almost entirely devoted to such matter. Or, let them buy a mimeograph of their own. It should not be difficult for them to secure lists of all the persons to whom the national office sends its bulletins. Indeed there is no reason why the complete list of Locals should not be supplied to any one who is willing to pay for the trouble of having them copied.

The attempt which is sometimes made to keep them secret is only a part of the same tendency, that is now only too frequently exemplified, of the idea that the party membership needs a guardian. Some state secretaries and party officials seem to fear that if these lists were common property, the membership would be "corrupted." This assumption of lack of judgment is a gratuitous insult to the rank and file, without the slightest justification.

It is somewhat amusing, however, to note in this connection that the one state which has most jealously guarded its list of members is now sending forth a wail of complaint because it could not secure the list of other states to get its statement before the members. This whole subject of party guardianship and its accompanying idea that the machinery of the party as such is of paramount importance is one of the most deadening influences with which socialist progress has to contend at the present time. For proof of this it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that those cities in which these special guardians are most active are as a general rule the ones with the smallest party membership, the lowest vote, and in short with the least effective activity in all direction. The party organization exists to do a work. It is an organ with a function to perform, not a creation to be supported for itself. The very best way to develop an organ is to utilize it in the highest degree. The function of the party machinery is education, agitation, and organization. That organization will be the most effective, will have the clearest socialist principles, will do the most work which is kept continuously busy in the work of socialist activity.

On the other hand that party organization, local, state or national whose members occupy their time only with discussions of the machinery of party activity will soon find itself attacked with a sort of dry rot which will paralyze all activity and end with the destruction of the machine itself. Only by use, can the form of party organization be determined and there is little use of the organism when its entire strength is used in self examination.

Along with this same attitude of mind goes an exaggerated idea of the importance of official position. This seems to have attacked some of our national committeemen quite badly, until they consider that the

entire party is lying awake nights to learn what their individual opinions are on party matters. They do not look upon themselves as servants of the party to carry on the work of agitation and education, and extension of organization, but rather as monitors and guardians whose business it is to see that the membership do not wander from the straight and narrow path, and are furnished with frequent official opinions as to their own duties and activities. To them the only party news is party quarrels, the only form of party activity the criticism of party machinery. The fact that the city of Milwaukee has acted very foolishly in relation to some forms of party organization is considered of much more importance than that it has carried on the most active socialist propaganda of perhaps any city of similar size in the United States. That Minnesota is now torn by internal dissensions, and that a couple of her officials have sought to exercise a little brief authority, becomes of a great deal more importance than the fact that the entire national organization is handicapped by lack of literature and speakers. This does not say that breaches of party tactics should not be rebuked or punished, neither that the form of organization should be neglected, but merely that these are not the only thing with which the party machine is concerned. Neither does it follow that the half dozen members of the national committee who have been most busily occupied along these lines have been especially selected by nature for the position of party guardians. It is probable that the membership in Minnesota and Wisconsin is as intelligent as that in most of the other states, and it is certain that they can take care of their own business better than one or two committeemen from other states. If there is one point where discipline is needed today and needed badly it is with regard to those officials who are usurping the powers that belong to the membership, who are hampering the work of the entire movement, who are exhausting the energies of the national office and cramming the columns of our party press with petty details (such as many a local settles every few months without any disturbance whatever) to the exclusion of the infinitely more important work that lies before us.

A very good idea of how the national office is now looked upon by the members of the national committee is given by the motion recently made by Comrade Work of Iowa to strike out that portion of the state and municipal program providing for a municipal secretary. It is evidently impossible for some members of the present national committee to see the use of a man in the national office who should be engaged in anything else besides running a mimeograph, to preserve and circulate the precious opinions of party officials concerning each others actions. As a matter of fact this is the most essential portion of the entire program, since it alone provides for effective continuous work. In his comment he declares that this provides for a fifth and sixth wheel to the party machinery, and states that "the committees already existing should have general charge of the matter." Unfortunately these committees have

shown themselves hopelessly incapable of taking charge of anything, as witness what a bungle they have made of such a very simple thing as the issuing of a few propaganda pamphlets. On the other hand the national secretary and his assistants have, on the whole, shown a willingness and capacity for doing things, when unhampered by such fifth wheels as the National Executive Committee.

THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

At the recent convention of the metal polishers and affiliated crafts at St. Louis the following proposition was adopted:

"Resolved, That the Metal Polishers, Buffers, Platers, Brass Molders, Brass and Silver Workers' Union of North America recommend all affiliated workers to study the principles and philosophy of socialism; be it further

"Resolved, That a committee be appointed to devise a plan of action in harmony with the spirit and letter of the above declaration, to be submitted to the next convention of the American Federation of Labor."

As has been pointed out in the REVIEW, at the recent referendum, A. B. Grout, of Kenosha, Wis., formerly of Chicago, was elected general president. Grout is an ardent Socialist and a hard-working, conscientious young man, and he is going to make his mark in the labor movement. During the past few years there is no organization in the country, excepting the Western Federation of Miners, that has been up against so many desperate fights as the polishers. In nearly every large industrial center of the country the capitalists of the Parry stripe have attacked this union with a vindictiveness second only to that of the Russian nobility in the attempt to mow down the workers. And yet the polishers and brassworkers, whose organization is formed along industrial lines, have withstood the onslaught quite successfully, and, instead of being cowed into submission and enslaved, they have learned the object lessons and are moving ahead to educate the membership to a full understanding of their position in society. The St. Louis convention acted wisely. Had they jammed through a resolution to endorse the Socialist party it would have meant nothing. But to declare in favor of studying the principles and philosophy of socialism means that the locals (and I know many of them in which the active workers are Socialists) will invest in Socialist literature and lectures and still further educate the men in the trade.

I have it from absolutely reliable sources—from the mouth of a so-called commissioner and indirectly from an operator—that next spring will see a general suspension of work in the bituminous districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and quite likely in Iowa, Michigan and less important mining states. "You see," said one of these gentlemen, "there is too much coal being mined and there is constant danger of prices being depressed. There are too many mines being operated—more than the market needs—and thousands of tons are being piled up that can't be sold. There they lay and money is tied up in them, and in the midst of this wealth hard times are actually staring us in the face." He admitted that even if the miners accepted lower wages it would not change the situation to any appreciable extent; he also admitted that the workers

are hard pressed and are employed but three or four days a week, and dismissed the whole subject by declaring that there are "too many mines in operation and too many workers depending upon the industry for an existence." Here is a text for every Socialist soap-box orator in the country. Under the present planless, anarchistic-capitalistic method of production tens of thousands of miners have worked too hard, even under the eight-hour day system, and they and their families will be compelled to suffer and starve while the wealth they produced and do not own is being consumed. In the anthracite field in Pennsylvania the condition is quite similar, except perhaps that the operators, taking advantage of the so-called over production, are imbued with the vindictive notion of enforcing the open-shop policy and destroying the union. So that a year or so hence, unless all signs fail, thousands of miners will be in want and other thousands of workers will stand in good chance of freezing because of the high price of coal, and because the god of profit must have his sacrifices under capitalism.

And this brings me to another very important point that the workers of this country ought to understand. In conversation with a man who holds a responsible position in the service of the United States government, and who travels about the country and comes in contact with capitalists in every line of industry, who occasionally unbosom themselves regarding labor matters, I have learned that the optimistic claims of our friend Gompers and his followers that the capitalists are abandoning their open-shop policy are wholly without foundation. It is well known that in nearly every contest of national significance between the organized capitalists and the organized workers upon the open-shop question the latter have lost—at least temporarily—and it is a fact that the capitalists have become more fully aroused and have gone ahead and strengthened their lines much more rapidly than we, probably largely for the reasons that they have fewer people to organize and are quicker to understand their interests as a class. However, to get back to the government agent. In a certain city, in which the Parryites had been particularly active in fighting the unions in the building and metal trades, the printing office proprietors were slow to declare for the open-shop policy, undoubtedly because the printers had practically every plant organized. The "commissioner" (or talking agent) of the employers' association approached the owners of the printing establishments and urged them to stand for the open shop. He received little satisfaction, the bosses declaring that it would mean a hard and long fight with the printers and affiliated craftsmen. In a few days thereafter a multi-millionaire in the metal trades visited the largest printing office proprietor in the city and said: "Mr. Blank, you do not do printing for yourselves; you depend upon us. Now I am unalterably in favor of the open shop. I had a fight with my men and it cost me a large sum of money to enforce the principles that I believe in. You ought to join us in repelling the demands of these trade unions. You cannot expect me to contract with your firm for catalogue work and other printing if you meekly submit to your employes and thus encourage ours to organize and make unreasonable demands." Other manufacturers had interviews with their boss printers and in a short time the latter surrendered completely, and, instead of "running their business to suit themselves," they hung up open-shop signs, forced a strike, gave the "commissioner" full charge to supply rats, and spent thousands upon thousands of dollars to defeat the men with whom they had been upon friendly terms, big bunches of money coming from the Parryites to aid the employers. Similar tactics have been pursued in a number of other cities that I might name if it were policy to do so, and it looks as though the scheme outlined above has become a general one among the capitalistic union-smashers.

The brutality and coercion of the Parryites surpasses anything that has ever been attempted by unions. Ruination and beggary stares in the face those who dare to defy the Parry edicts. The open shop demand of the capitalists is one of the greatest issues of our time, and unfortunately the craze has seized hold of employers who are not identified with capitalistic associations, and they parrot the Parryite phrases as though they were really the defenders of the people's liberties, instead of being engaged in a campaign, which, if successful, will mean complete slavery for the workers. No other hostile acts—no police or military brutality, no court injunctions, no enactment of vicious laws—have so thoroughly aroused the organized toilers of the country to a realization of the fact that a class struggle is raging, which threatens to force hard conditions upon them and their children, as this open shop movement. You hear the unionists discussing it wherever you go, and the sentiment in favor of carrying the war to the political field is sweeping throughout the country despite all that can be done by the so-called pure and simple leaders to discourage political action through the Socialist party, as well as the hysterical efforts of the professional politicians to obscure this momentous question. The cry of the workers to-day is much like that of the men of the last generation: "This country cannot be half free and half slave—we will preserve the union at any cost!" And the methods of the employers are not unlike those of the slave power of the South before the sixties—we have the Legrees of the Parry stripe and the St. Clairs of the Nelson kind. The courts have given us new Dred Scott decisions, and we also have our Kansas-Nebraska compromises, and the bull pens of Colorado may prove the Bull Run of the modern struggle, which, judging from every indication, is increasing in severity and will not be settled until it is settled right. At this juncture no Socialist can afford to dicker and waste valuable time in splitting hairs. It is his duty to take a broad, tolerant position so far as working class policies are concerned and to embrace every opportunity to aid in educating the masses to a proper understanding of the dangers that confront them and the right solution of the labor problem.

The long and bitter struggle that has been waged by the brewery workers on the one hand and the engineers and firemen on the other for jurisdiction over employes in brewing establishments will be forced into the background at the coming A. F. of L. convention by the quarrel that has broken out between the longshoremen and the seamen. For several years the longshoremen have been branching out upon industrial lines and absorbing practically every craft on and along the waterways upon the North American continent. The seamen's officials have watched the encroachments of the "land lubbers" with a jealous eye, and, fearing that they would be swallowed sooner or later by the industrial whale, made an attack upon the longshoremen, who, in order to absorb certain crafts whose members float upon the bounding billows, attached the words "Transport Workers" to their official name. The sailor men protested to the A. F. of L. against granting their rivals the right to change their name and were sustained, but the longshoremen not only retained the prescribed words, but continued to reach for members upon the waters. Thereupon the seamen brought their troubles into the San Francisco convention of the Federation, and a hard fight was made which resulted in a draw. During the past year, however, a secession has developed in the longshoremen's organization on the Pacific Coast and the sailors are openly aiding the bolters, and, quite naturally, the longshoremen are threatening dire retaliation. Both national bodies will demand that the charter of its opponent be revoked at the Pittsburg convention of the A. F. of L. next month, and there promises to be a struggle between the industrialists and autonomists, such as has never been seen before. In this connection it

might be added that certain national officers of both organizations have not hesitated to charge upon the floor of the Federation, whenever their policies were questioned by delegates who are Socialists, that the latter were trade union disrupters and an all-around suspicious lot. But now they seem to be tarred by their own stick, and, instead of the Socialists being shining marks for their unjust attacks, the "reds" will probably be given a rest—at least while the other fellows are busy proclaiming the villainy of their hated rivals. An effort is also to be made in this convention to prevent jurisdiction wars being injected into the annual sessions by forcing the contending unions to settle their own troubles or agree that the decisions arrived at by the delegates, when called upon to pass judgment, shall be final. Whether this scheme will work out or not is problematical. A Federation convention without a bunch of jurisdiction scraps would be like a Donnybrook fair whose patrons had all suddenly become angels. And yet it is high time that something were done to put an end to the wasteful jurisdiction fights, so that a solid front could be presented to the common enemy.

The journeymen tailors and the garment workers are in a fair way to end their jurisdiction disputes. Throughout the present year officials of those organizations have been negotiating plans for an amalgamation of both unions, and while a slight hitch occurred at the last moment it is believed that all differences will be overcome and unity will prevail.

The eight-hour movement of the printers has been started earlier than expected. The journeymen did everything in their power to obtain a peaceful adjustment of the matter, but their overtures were met with lockouts in a number of cities, whereupon the union declared a general strike against the employers' organization and is now engaged in battle. The printers have already won their demands in several hundred small towns and are making steady gains in the larger cities.

Although the general election in the International Association of Machinists was held in August, the result of the balloting is not yet known. The latest reports are to the effect that the tally sheets were lost, strayed or stolen in Washington. The official ballot, owing to the lack of some rational system in making nominations, was the worst jumble that was ever known in any labor organization. It was about a mile long, and at a glance an outsider would imagine that nearly every member in the I. A. M. was running for office. It is being charged that the administration was opposed to the referendum and purposely allowed it to become farcical, and that all the nominations, complimentary or otherwise, were submitted to the membership in order to divide the field and re-elect the present officers. Whether or not those charges are true remains to be seen.

It is reported that Mat Cummerford, a Socialist, has defeated John E. Brunner as general president of the National Association of Steam Engineers. Brunner was a Democratic politician in Cincinnati and was largely responsible for the bad feeling that was engendered between the brewers and the engineers and firemen.

SOCIALISM ABROAD

SWEDEN.

Sweden at the present time seems to be in the grasp of reaction. A law has been passed which practically makes striking a crime. This law was particularly directed at the railroad employes. Nevertheless their organization has grown with great rapidity since the enactment of these laws and, supported by the other unions, now announces that if any attempt is made to enforce the law a general strike will be at once declared. In the meantime the socialist vote is steadily increasing. Elections have been going on all through the month of September. Full reports have not yet been received but the socialists have already won some votes where they had none before and have made large gains everywhere.

FRANCE.

One of the most striking developments of the French socialist movement at present is the great increase in the number of socialist teachers. At a recent congress of the French teachers held at Lille the socialists were practically in control. A resolution was presented providing that in the study of history the aim should always be the creation of a revolutionary attitude in the sense of the revolution of 1792. This was intended to be an expression of bourgeois radicalism, but it was thought by the use of the word "revolution" that socialist votes might be caught by it. Socialists refused to be caught by this bait but introduced and carried a resolution instead that history must be considered as a science, and not utilized for the development of any particular theory. A second resolution also dealt with revolutionary phrases, but was in fact intended as endorsement of capitalistic patriotism. In response to this the socialists introduced and carried the following resolution:

"The French teachers are unqualified defenders of peace, they have as their motto 'war against war,' but this does not prevent them from defending their country when it shall be the subject of a brutal aggression."

The reactionary press have declared that this resolution is simply a repetition of the International Socialist position and are attacking the teachers' organization. This organization which includes 115,000 teachers has voted to adopt the position of a trade union in its activity and to affiliate with the unions in other trades employed by the government.

Owing to the protest of the socialists against the use of the military in time of labor trouble the government issued instructions that the greatest care should be taken not to injure workingmen. Nevertheless at a recent strike at Longwy a peaceable laborer who chanced to be standing by was seriously wounded by a lance. While this might not have attracted any attention in America, yet in France with a strong socialist fraction in the chamber of deputies it was a different matter. The minister of war has expressed his regret and has sent a substantial contribution to a fund which was raised for the relief of the injured man's family, but the socialists do not propose to let it drop here and insist that the use of armed troops against strikers shall cease.

NORWAY.

The social democrats of Norway have been carrying on an active campaign for the establishment of a republic. So successful have they been that many of the bourgeois papers are now taking the same attitude. But the socialists have no desire to see an ordinary bourgeois republic and the *Social Demokraten* declares that: "A Republic is now certain, but the question is, what kind of a republic. Some republics are worse than monarchies. Whatever form is adopted must come from the people and be subject to their control."

HUNGARY.

Events have recently taken a strange turn in Hungary. For many years there has been continuous friction between the Hungarian and Austrian elements. This largely took on the form of a quarrel about the use of the Hungarian language. Recently the question came up of a renewal of the *Ausgleich*, as the bond of unity between the two countries is commonly called. The Hungarians came forward with the demand for a further recognition of the Hungarian language. The Austrian Minister of the Interior thinking he saw an opportunity to spread confusion in his opponents' ranks proposed to couple the grant of this with a law providing for universal suffrage. He certainly accomplished his object, but he also conjured up forces of whose existence he evidently never dreamed. The aristocratic Hungarian patriots who had been shouting so loudly for a free Hungary at once drew back in dismay at the proposition of a freedom which should include the working class. The socialists, on the other hand, who had stood somewhat aloof from the language question, now suddenly became most enthusiastic patriots, at least so far as this question of universal suffrage was concerned. From *Politik*, of Prague, we take the following description of the result:

"Throughout the whole country meetings with almost countless attendants are being held. Whereas the socialists have hitherto come only from the Magyars, at the present time they find themselves supported by a great mass of people of all nationalities." Indeed so far has this agitation gone that Hungary is practically in a state of revolution. Old party lines have been wiped out both in Austria and Hungary, and the minister of the interior is so badly frightened at the result of his political trick as to consider the advisability of withdrawing it.

On the 15th of September the Hungarian parliament met only to adjourn again, until the 10th of October. The occasion of the meeting, how-

ever, was utilized for a tremendous demonstration in favor of universal suffrage by the workers of Budapest. We take the following account from the Berlin *Vorwärts*:

"The tremendous movement which is being carried on by the Hungarian working class for the attainment of universal and equal suffrage reached its highest point in the march upon the parliament building which was held to-day. . . . Amidst the ringing sound of the Marseilles the laborers marched toward the parliament building. From all ends and corners of the great city the revolutionary song sounded. Budapest has never before seen such a popular assemblage. All industries were closed, partly because of a fear of the "red terror," partly because of the simple fact that the workers were taking part in the demonstration. All the schools were closed. In the early hours of morning the curious were occupying every street where the procession of laborers was expected. Red placards were fastened upon the walls of the houses, calling upon the workers to take part in the demonstration by marching.

"Lay down your work!" read these placards, "Out upon the streets, workers! Demonstrate for universal suffrage!"

Seven places had been chosen for assembly, and by half past seven these were thronged with laborers ready to begin the march, so timed as to arrive at the opening hour of parliament, half past eight. At eight o'clock the march began. From Constitution Street came the first sounds of the Marseilles. It was the type setters who were singing. Red placards were carried by them bearing the inscription, "Give us the right to have a fatherland." Following them came a long line of women, factory workers, marching, also singing the Marseilles, towards the place of meeting. These wore placards across their breasts with the inscription, "Give us universal suffrage!" . . . On the open space before the parliament building the great assemblage gathered until it was estimated that over 60,000 people were present. The red placards in their hats formed long flaming lines. Over their heads waved the flags and the banners and out of the tumult rose the red placards with the inscriptions. Far back from the main body ran streets black with human beings, unable to reach the meeting ground. After some preliminaries a committee was at last admitted with a petition reading as follows:

"Honorable President! The petition which I, with my comrades, bear, speaks in the name of the unprivileged millions of this country to those who have the right which we desire, and who, because of this privilege constitute the present Hungarian parliament. If you, Mr. President, will look around you, and throw your glance out upon the parliament grounds you will gain a picture of what is taking place throughout the entire country. We are but a few here, many more remain without before the door of parliament, and further out in the land there are yet millions more standing at the door of the constitution. Because of an outgrown election law Hungary is divided into two parts: into the citizens of a first and second degree. Law, which should be a common good of all, uniting all, drawing us all closer together, creates privileges and raises barriers between us. To raise this privilege to a universal right, since all are worthy of it, is our desire. To tear down these barriers is our object. It is our firm belief, and our inmost conviction, that this is not only the desire of the millions of unprivileged inhabitants of this country, but that this is the only possibility and offers the only means by which Hungary may become great, large and strong. For the social, cultural, and political progress we are firmly convinced there is only one way and that is through the whole people, who are to-day surrounded with barriers, and we therefore petition this house of representatives to abolish these barriers and then the stream of the millions will press forward with

irresistible power on the road of progress and cultural development. We know well that we can receive no answer here, but we wish to make it known that the word we raise here is the word of the people, and that parliament may respond to it as an announcement of popular will to determine whether it will prepare the way to the abolition of the present condition, a condition antagonistic to progress, unjust and hostile to the people. We have come to the knowledge and we go out from here with that knowledge that to-day will remain famous in the history of Hungary. Even though the people may stand in vain before the door of the constitution, and be driven back without result, we know this, because we know that to-day is only the beginning of the battle that is to set a whole people in motion. We hope, however, that the present day may not only become noteworthy in this manner, but still more, because it will indicate the beginning of victory and the introduction of a new epoch in the history of Hungary in which the people will be given that which to the people belongs, in which the fatherlandless shall be given a fatherland."

After an indefinite and uncommunicative reply from the president the deputation withdrew and the assembled thousands dispersed to take up anew the agitation with great enthusiasm.

JAPAN.

We have just received a letter from Comrade Kotoku enclosing clippings from the English sections of the Japanese papers telling of the anti-peace demonstrations. From these it appears that they were very much more extensive than the capitalist press of this country admitted. The entire police department was demoralized and the police boxes destroyed. Several stations kept in state of siege, numerous churches burned, and the imperial residence surrounded and subjected to a long and violent attack. The rage of the mob was also directed toward the street railroad company and a large number of their cars burned. The casualties among the police were reported to amount to 60 while these among the public were at least three hundred.

From Comrade Kotoku's letter we take the following extracts: "The Japanese government is now receiving the natural but dreadful result of patriotism and jingoism, which it has previously aroused. Since the 5th of September the city of Tokyo has been drowned in a sea of fire and blood, many innocent people were killed by the police and at last a state of siege was proclaimed. Eleven newspapers were forced to suspend publication, and our *Chokugen* was seized by the police on the 10th of September and its publication suspended. The director of the Tokyo post office has been invested with the right to confiscate private letters and telegrams and the inspector general of the Metropolitan police has prohibited or dissolved all political meetings." He also states that, "The true cause of this disturbance is much more the discontent of the people against a corrupt bureaucracy, although it was started in the 'name of anti-peace.'"

From the last issue of *Chokugen* we learn that Comrade Kotoku has been sick since his release from the imprisonment which he suffered during the war because of his socialism. The same paper states that he intends to make a trip to America shortly in order to recover his health.

GERMANY.

As a part of the reaction against the excessive parliamentarism which has ruled in the German social democracy during the last few years a recent meeting in Berlin is noteworthy. Dr. Friedeberg, one of the prominent members of the Social Democratic party addressed a meeting of the trades unions of Berlin, and offered a resolution which was almost unanimously adopted by those present, criticising the tactics of the Social Democratic party and practically forming a new party which has taken the rather ridiculous name of anarcho-socialist. This new organization, whose members still rise in righteous indignation when the *Vorwaerts* no longer refers to them as comrades, declares for a more liberal use of the general strike, and the placing of less emphasis on political methods. Although the capitalist press have made very much of this first and only break in the ranks of the great socialist party of Germany, yet it is probable that the *Vorwaerts* is right in saying that it will soon fizzle out. It will probably, however, in co-operation with other forces, compel the party to lay more stress on other than parliamentary activity

BOOK REVIEWS

PARIS AND THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION, by *Alvan Francis Sanborn*. Small Maynard & Co., Cloth, 404 pp., \$3.00.

Pictures and text alike are bright, keen flashlights, brilliant in conception, clever in execution, and remarkably shrewd in their insight. The preface is so good that the temptation to quote in full is strong, but it is just a little too long for that purpose. In it the author claims to be a conservative of the conservatives, loving old things better than the new, yet withal loving revolutionists at the same time. When he tells us "What the Anarchist Wants" he lets the anarchist do his own talking in a series of quotations from Jean Grave, Kropotkin and Reclus. In the chapter on "The Oral Propaganda of Anarchy" we learn how meetings are "captured" and a tireless talking campaign is carried on, much like propagandists have always conducted since the world began. But by far the most interesting chapters are those that tell how the anarchists live and play and eat and starve and die. Here we have a series of pen pictures of the Latin Quarter of Paris such as we do not remember ever having met in any work designed especially to depict life in that famous locality. Here we see also how the revolutionary spirit has invaded literature and art, and developed its own music and drama. Of one thing there can be no doubt, —the author has filled himself with the spirit of his subject, he has entered into it, lived it, studied it, until it pours forth from his pen point, with a wealth of illustrations and incidents that makes every page a human document. But when we come to consider the work as a sober contribution to sociological literature (whether the author ever intended it to be so considered or not is hard to tell) we are disappointed. Although the title reads "Paris and the Social Revolution," yet nearly all the real forces which are making for a social revolution in Paris are neglected. It is not these singers, players and *poseurs* of the cafes that will bring about a revolution. They are but the froth on the top of the great revolutionary wave of the proletarian movement which is never mentioned in this book. To be sure these men will fight, or starve or sing or shriek out revolutionary phrases from the top of a cafe table, but if the revolutionary force of France was confined to these the bourgeoisie might rest in peace. But there is a revolutionary movement in France with a million adherents behind it that is threatening the whole plutocratic structure, the Socialist movement. Yet of this he has only a few paragraphs, and these almost disdainful and apologetic. Had he called his book "Anarchy and Anarchists in the Latin Quarter" it would have been more fitting to his text.

SOCIALISM AND CHRISTIANITY, by the Rt. Rev. Wm. Stang, D. D., Bishop of Fall River. Benziger Bros. Cloth, 207 pages.

While the work of Cathrein-Gettelman indicated at least that the author had studied socialism, the same cannot be said for this work. Neither does it in any way reflect the scholarship of the previous work. In fact the present author seems to largely depend upon plain bare-faced lies for argument.

He refers to Rudolph Grossman an "editor of a German socialistic paper in Chicago called the *Fackel*," in spite of the fact that this editor and his paper are perhaps the most notorious anarchists in the United States and bitterly hostile to socialism.

He states, among other things, that, "According to the socialist theory a man has no right to his earnings," that, "according to the United States census of 1900 more than half of the entire net product of manufacturing and mechanical industries was paid out to labor." The fact being that the census shows nothing of the kind whatever, but on the contrary shows that the working man only receives about one-eighth the product.

He turns a large portion of his venom against the public school, and once more the socialists can well afford to be in such good company. He goes through some interesting historical gymnastics in attempting to show that the golden age was just prior to the Protestant Reformation, and that this was all due to the domination of the Catholic church. We have no desire to defend Luther or the Protestant Reformation, but we never heard that either of them was responsible for the invention of the steam engine, the discovery of America or the establishment of the factory system.

To go through this book and point out the errors and falsehoods that abound in it would be a waste of space. For those who want to know the Catholic side we still advise the reading of Cathrein-Gettelman's book, the translator of which, by the way, has been flooding Catholic publications with fervid denunciations of our recent review. Since his attack rests largely on a point which is also repeated in the present work it might be worth a few sentences in reply.

Mr. Gettelman takes objection to our denial of his statement that the German socialists were opposed to legislation for the betterment of the workers, and repeats the story which has long ago been worn out in Germany that the socialists have voted against the reform legislation proposed by the Catholic Center Party. To be sure they have, because that party has generally taken all the life out of any legislation intended for the benefit of the workers. Will Mr. Gettelman please explain where those three million votes came from if the socialist party of Germany is doing nothing for the working class of that country? It would also be interesting if he would explain to his Catholic readers the details of the alliance made between the Catholics and the Lutherans in Germany for the sake of organizing scab unions. Our columns are open to him for this purpose at any time.

FORCES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM IN AMERICA, by John Spargo. Charles H. Kerr & Co. Paper, 32 pages, 10 cents.

We welcome this edition to the literature of international socialism for many reasons. In the first place it is quite different from the conventional propaganda pamphlets. This is not simply that it is better written, with good literary style and logical, systematic arrangement, but that both in title and contained matter it deals with facts in immediate touch with the life of America. It should play a considerable part in the propaganda work, of the socialist party.

PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

LATEST BOOKS

Issued by the Co-operative Publishing House of Charles H. Kerr & Company

FRANCÉ, R. H. *Germes of Mind in Plants*. Translated by A. M. Simons. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 2. Cloth, 50 cents.

"This volume treats of the many voluntary actions of plants that indicate something very much like, if not identical with, intelligence. * * * The author makes science readable and attractive, for the book holds the attention as only fairy stories are supposed to do. The problem of human life is inseparable from the problem of all life, and this fascinating contribution to popular literature will go far toward establishing among the many those scientific principles upon which a rational conception of nature and human relations must be based."—Appeal to Reason.

MEYER, DR. M. WILHELM. *The End of the World*. Translated by Margaret Wagner. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 3. Cloth, 50 cents.

Worlds and suns, like men, animals and plants, have their birth, growth, maturity, decline and death. And in each case death means transformation into new life in some other form. Our world like the rest must have an end, and this end will involve the extinction of all human life on its surface. But Dr. Meyer's little book is reassuring in that it shows the chances to be a million to one against the end coming in the time of any who are now living. The latest facts of science, in so far as they touch on the various destructive forces that may in time bring the world to an end, are fully set forth, and illustrated with drawings and photographs. The style is as charming as that of the preceding volumes in the library.

UNTERMANN, ERNEST. *Science and Revolution*. Library of Science for the Workers, Vol. 4. Cloth, 50 cents.

In this work the author traces the development of the evolution theory from the earliest scientific writings that have been preserved down to the present time. He shows that throughout history there have been two

opposing tendencies in the interpretation of the facts of the universe. Ruling classes, living on the labor of others, have constantly supported in some form or other the idea of a supernatural power to be recognized as supreme, while the rebellious workers have slowly been evolving the conception of the universe as one and self-controlled. In his concluding chapter, Materialist Monism, the Science and Religion of the Proletariat, he shows more adequately than any previous writer that the philosophy of Socialism is the necessary outcome of modern science.

MARX, ENGELS, LIEBKNECHT. *The Communist Manifesto*, by Marx and Engels, and *No Compromise*, by Liebknecht. Standard Socialist Series, Vol. 11. Cloth, 50 cents.

This replaces our former cloth edition of the Communist Manifesto, which was in a shape far less convenient for the library and includes a valuable work by Liebknecht which until now has been obtainable only in pamphlet form. No Socialist library is complete without this volume.

GLADYS, EVELYN. *Thoughts of a Fool*. Extra cloth, \$1.00.

A volume of revolutionary essays attacking the hypocrisies of capitalism in a style that is nothing if not refreshing. The author is not a member of the Socialist Party, and three or four phrases scattered through the book betray misconceptions of the aims of international Socialism. But the main emphasis of the book is on the vital Socialist principle that happiness is the natural and inevitable aim of every intelligent being, and that it is simple stupidity on the part of workers to let themselves be deceived by capitalistic moralizers into acting for the happiness of their masters instead of their own happiness. The book is easy reading, as may be guessed from chapter-headings like "How Smart I Am," "On the Ground Floor," "Shoes, Pigs and Problems," "The Fly and the Donkey," "Boiled Cabbage," etc. The book is beautifully printed and bound, the biggest dollar's worth we have yet been able to offer.

VAIL, CHARLES H. *Modern Socialism*. Cloth, 75 cents; paper, 25 cents. Also by the same author, *Principles of Scientific Socialism*. Paper, 35 cents.

Comrade Vail's books have long been recognized as among the best popular expositions of scientific Socialism in any language. They have until lately been published in the east, but we have purchased the plates and copyrights from the author, and shall hereafter supply them on the same terms as our own publications.

COLE, JOSEPHINE R. *Socialist Songs, Dialogues and Recitations*. Paper, 25 cents.

This book has been issued in response to a long continued demand for something available for use at Socialist entertainments. Most of the selections are suited to the comprehension of children, and some of them would not be bad for Socialist children to recite at the public schools when opportunity offers.

SPARGO, JOHN. *Forces that Make for Socialism in America*. A lecture at Cooper Union, New York City. Paper, 10 cents.

An up-to-date-propaganda book by one of the ablest of our Socialist writers and speakers. Just the thing to sell at meetings. It puts the Socialist argument in a way that will make votes.

CLEARANCE SALE OF SOCIALIST LITERATURE.

We are getting crowded for space, and we are in urgent need of ready money to pay for the new books that are coming out. These low prices are to close out at once a few odd lots of good socialist literature that we shall not keep regularly hereafter.

INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW, unbound. Five volumes of twelve numbers each, 60 cents a volume postpaid. Any volume sold separately. No copies of Vol. 1, No. 3. Only six copies of No. 4. The first five to order a set at \$3.00 will miss but one number; those who are later will miss two numbers. Back numbers, our selection, 2 cents each, postpaid. In ordering say how many you can use of one kind. Specified back numbers 10 cents each.

SOCIALISM AND MODERN SCIENCE, by *Enrico Ferri*, \$1.00. To close out a limited number purchased from an eastern house we will sell them to stockholders while they last at 60 cents postpaid or 50 cents by express, the same as if we published them ourselves.

SOCIALISTISCHE BRIEFE. Blatchford's "Merrie England" translated into German by Victor L. Berger. Cloth, 50 cents; we offer them while they last at 30 cents postpaid. Paper, 25 cents; our price while they last 15 cents postpaid.

NATIONAL OWNERSHIP OF RAILWAYS. By *Rev. Charles H. Vail*. Paper, 15 cents; our price while they last 8 cents postpaid, 6 cents by express.

THE INDUSTRIAL EVOLUTION. By *Rev. Charles H. Vail*. Paper, 5 cents; we offer a few copies at 3 cents each or 30 cents a dozen postpaid; 24 cents a dozen by express.

POVERTY. By *Robert Hunter*. Publishers' price 25 cents net, postage 9 cents extra; we offer a few copies while they last at 25 cents postpaid.

MASS AND CLASS. By *W. J. Ghent*. Publishers' price 25 cents net, postage 7 cents extra; we offer a few copies while they last at 25 cents postpaid.

CLEARANCE SALE OF MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

We have a considerable stock of books not directly related to socialism, but for the most part well worth reading. They are taking up valuable space in our stock room, and many of them have also been taking up space in our price list. They could be sold to booksellers by cutting the prices, but we prefer to give our stockholders the benefit of the cut prices,

and so we offer them at the following rates to our stockholders or to any one subscribing for a share of stock.

PAPER NOVELS AT FIVE CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *Sister Gratia*, (*Satan's Simplicity*) by C. Edgar Snow; *Jetta*, a Story of the South, by Semrick; *Dan the Tramp*, by Laura Abbott; the *Auroraphone*, by Cyrus Cole; *Paul St Paul*, a Son of the People., by Ruby Beryl Kyle; *The Co-opolitan*, by Zebina Forbush; *Silas Hood*, by Henry Thornton; *A New Woman*, by Jessie De Foliart Hamblin; *A Story from Pullmantown*, by Nico Bech-Meyer; *The Modern Banker*, by J. Bryan Goode; *Man or Dollar, Which?* by a Newspaper Man.

PAPER NOVELS AT FIFTEEN CENTS. By mail eight cents extra. *Cast Thou the First Stone*, by Frances Marie Norton; *The Garden of Eden*, U. S. A., by W. H. Bishop; *A Daughter of Humanity*, by Edgar M. Smith; *Ahead of the Hounds*, by Lydia Platt Richards.

CLOTH NOVELS AT TEN CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *A Story of Pullmantown*, by Nico Bech-Meyer; *Elsie*, by Alexander Kjelland; *From Over the Border*, by Benj. Smith; *The Last War*, by B. F. Odell.

CLOTH NOVELS AT TWENTY CENTS. By mail ten cents extra. *The Story of a Dream*, by Ethel Maude Colson; *Roberta*, by Blanche Fearing; *On the Road to the Lake*, by Sam Flint; *Ahead of the Hounds*, by Lydia Platt Richards; *A New Woman*, by Jessie DeFoliart Hamblin; *John Auburntop*, *Novelist*, by A. U. Hancock; *The Last Tenet*, by Hudor Genone; *The Auroraphone*, by Cyrus Cole; *Paul St. Paul a Son of the People*, by Ruby Beryl Kyle; *Washington Brown, Farmer*, by Leroy Armstrong.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPER BOOKS AT FIVE CENTS. Postage six cents extra if sent by mail. *A Breed of Barren Metal*, by J. W. Bennett; *The Impending Crisis*, by Basis Bouroff (copies with soiled covers); *Money Found*, by Thomas E. Hill; *The Morals of Christ*, by Austin Bierbower; *Rome and Washington*, by Elizabeth Morton; *Bond and Industrial Slavery*, by E. A. Twitchell; *Workaday Poems*, by a Worker; *The Pullman Strike*, by Rev. W. H. Carwardine; *Nine Lessons in Photography*, illustrated; *The Thought of God in Hymns and Poems*, by Hosmer and Gannett.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPER BOOKS AT FIFTEEN CENTS. Postage if sent by mail eight cents extra. *History of the Arguments for the Existence of God*, by Dr. Aaron Hahn (covers soiled); *The Civil War in France*, by Karl Marx; *Our Nation's History and Song*, by Joseph Monroe Clary. This last is a book of nearly 500 pages, containing statistics of all national elections up to 1896, with the full text of the campaign songs from Washington's time down.

MISCELLANEOUS CLOTH BOOKS AT TEN CENTS. By mail six cents extra. *The Legend of Hamlet*, by George P. Hansen; *Money*

Found, by Thomas E. Hill; Theodore Parker, by Samuel Johnson; Launching and Landing (Poems) by Perry Marshall; Evolutionary Politics, by Walter Thomas Mills; An Equitable Exchange System, by Alfred R. Justice; Evolution and Christianity, by J. C. F. Grumbine.

MISCELLANEOUS CLOTH BOOKS AT TWENTY CENTS. By mail ten cents extra. The Morals of Christ, by Austin Bierbower; Suggestion the Secret of Sex, by C. Wilbur Taber; The Thought of God in Hymns and Poems, by Hosmer and Gannett (full morocco); Flowers of the Spirit (Poems) by Ella A. Giles.

THE FINANCES OF THE PUBLISHING HOUSE.

Those who read this department each month will remember that I made an offer, good until the end of 1905, that I would duplicate every contribution made by others for the purpose of clearing off the debt of the publishing house. The amounts received on this offer to the end of September are as follows:

Previously acknowledged	\$813.82
Dr. P. E. Gold, Texas50
Frank Kostack, Ohio	5.00
H. P. Bennett, Colorado	10.00
R. A. Bennett, Colorado75
Howard Keehn, Pennsylvania	1.00
R. B. Ringler, Pennsylvania	2.50
R. S. Price, Texas	2.00
"B," Michigan	1.00
Member Commonwealth Club, Illinois.	1.00
Otto Hansen, Illinois.	29.52
Charles H. Kerr, Illinois	53.27
Total	<hr/> \$920.36

As was explained in last month's Review, the most urgent debts are \$400 to a bank, on which we are paying 7 per cent, and \$1,500 to a Wyoming stockholder, on which we are paying 6 per cent. The current receipts from the sale of books will take care of the current expenses, and if the debt just referred to can be raised among the stockholders and friends of the publishing house, it will be possible to use all money received from the sale of stock in publishing new books.

My object in offering to duplicate the contributions of others was to appeal to the few socialists who are so fortunately situated that they can contribute large sums to the cause without undue sacrifices. There are distinct limits to the field in which money can be put into the cause without the danger of doing at least as much harm as good. Large contributions to the party organization tend to encourage extravagance in officials and listlessness in the membership; while to subsidize part of the

propaganda papers increases the burdens of the ones not subsidized, by keeping alive competitors that ought to be out of the way.

Our co-operative publishing house is now made up of 1,148 stockholders, including 227 socialist locals, branches and clubs. I am temporarily holding a few shares which are being sold on monthly payments to single holders, but about nine-tenths of the stock is owned by socialists who have subscribed each for a single share. Thus the control is democratic, and it will be impossible for any man or any small group of men to divert the assets of the company from the purpose of socialist propaganda.

The company is still owing me individually about \$8,000, which is much more than it owes all others combined. I have no other property, and I owe a personal debt of \$1,000 which must be paid in less than a year. I would cheerfully contribute \$7,000 to put the publishing house on a thoroughly substantial basis, provided a like sum is contributed by others.

This is addressed to those who can help more conveniently with money than with personal work. Active party workers can help the publishing house more by sending their money for literature, selling it and turning in the proceeds for more literature than by making a direct contribution. There are, however, several readers of the Review any one of whom could lift the entire debt with far less sacrifice than was made by the farm laborer who was the largest contributor in September. Detailed figures of the company's finances will cheerfully be given to any one who wishes to help if he can be assured that the help will be effective.

Meanwhile most of our readers can help most by finding new subscribers to the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW and new purchasers for our books.

CHARLES H. KERR.